



Accessions

153,648

Shelf No.

G. 3953.28

*Barton Library.*



*Thomas Bennett, Boston.*

**Boston Public Library.**

*Received, May, 1873.*

*Not to be taken from the Library.*











Page  
126-150 - Physics  
256 - Presentation Removable

1892

1892

A N  
INVESTIGATION  
O F  
Mr. Malone's Claim to the Character  
O F  
SCHOLAR, or CRITIC,  
Being an Examination of his  
INQUIRY INTO THE AUTHENTICITY.  
O F T H E  
Shakspeare Manuscripts, &c.  
B Y  
SAMUEL IRELAND.

---

L O N D O N :

PUBLISHED BY R. FAULDER, NEW BOND STREET;  
T. EGERTON, WHITEHALL ; T. PAYNE, MEWS GATE ;  
AND WHITES, FLEET STREET.

INVESTIGATION

153.648

May. 1873.

Wm. H. Allen to the Clerk

SCHOLAR OF CHURCH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHURCH

BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHURCH



---

## P R E F A C E.

---

**I** SHOULD not have been desirous of reviving a controversy, which has for some time ceased to occupy the public attention ; or of entering into a discussion which the illiberal part of the world has caught at, for the purpose of indulging its natural propensity to malevolence ; and which a vain, weak, interested, and illiberal individual has used for the purpose of invading the peace of a private family, by introducing topics to which that discussion has no reference whatsoever. But I felt I had a right to expose the incompetency of Mr. Malone as a man of learning, upon

the only subject which he affects to know ; and I more strongly felt it a duty to expose his unworthy, and disingenuous conduct, as a Man. This object has led me into inquiries which could not be pursued without considerable diligence and labor. Yet though I have entered into minute researches, for the purpose of controverting the positions of this Gentleman, I have scrupulously abstained from the declaration of any opinion respecting the authenticity of the manuscripts themselves. I presume not to disturb the judgments of the public, if they have formed any, relative to the origin of the papers. The truth may probably be ascertained at some future period, when literary animosities shall have subsided, and the question shall have been taken up by less interested and more temperate enquirers.

It may be expected of me upon this occasion, to say something upon a narrative and confession recently laid before the public.

And

## P R E F A C E.

v

And near to me as by the ties of nature the author of that narrative is, it must be with sincere regret that I feel myself compelled to announce that he withdrew himself from my house and family in the beginning of June, 1796, that during this period, no intercourse beyond a short communication at two different times, but neither of them under my roof, in the presence of third parties has subsisted between us. Whatever measures therefore, he has taken, relative to the elucidation of the subject, and of whatever interpretation his conduct may be susceptible, cannot in the least affect me ; since he has been neither open to the remonstrances, nor influenced by the admonitions, which the moral and natural authority of a parent might have suggested on my part. And as to his confession, whether it receives credit, or whether it be altogether disbelieved, it does not affect the argument which I have offered in this tract. I have merely considered the reason-

ings

ings of Mr. Malone on the respective topics, which have arisen out of the controversy. I have attempted to prove that he is a bad reasoner, and a futile critic, and that the general inference, which he has drawn as to the authenticity of the manuscripts (whether true in fact or otherwise) is by no means established by that mode of proof which he has adduced, and the arguments he has used.



A N

INVESTIGATION, &c.

---

THE greatest difficulty which I have to encounter, in my examination of Mr. Malone's work, is that which arises from the superfluous matter, with which it abounds. The advantage which that author derives, from this redundant and desultory method of pursuing his subject, is very obvious. If he does not overpower his adversaries, he at least overwhelms his readers. They, who take up the book, not indeed from its bulk, but from the amplitude of its materials, are disposed to feel a prepossession in its favour; for where much labor has been obviously bestowed, some learning is necessarily inferred. Thus the greater part of its readers are stupified into assent, and are perplexed into acquiescence; because they are willing to give the author credit for having proved that, which their own indolence will not suffer them to examine.

Before however, the opinions of any critic are examined, it is proper to see, whether he has any right to maintain an opinion at all. On what grounds does the critical competence of Mr. Malone rest? In the beginning of his work he declares that he refused to inspect the papers; that he rejected every invitation for that purpose. He has himself pleaded his own disqualification.

All human opinion is the result of antecedent enquiry; and any opinion on any specific question, may be pronounced solid, or ill founded, according to the means and opportunities, which he who maintains it has had of enquiring into the evidence relative to it. Different questions require different evidence, and are tried by different senses; but on questions concerning certain visible and material instruments, inspection is the only standard to which reference is to be made. The eye alone examines into the evidence, because it is only by the eye, that minute analogies can be remarked; and comparisons of colors, shades, and resemblances fairly and accurately made. Mr. Malone says that he disdained to try this question by personal inspection. He rejected the only fair, and satisfactory method of arriving at a judgment upon the papers. Mr. Malone has therefore proved himself very incompetent to pronounce concerning their merits.

It



It is worth while to remark the words of Mr. Malone on this curious topic. " I very early resolved" he says " not to inspect them at the house of the possessor, and I was glad to find that my friends Dr. Farmer, and Mr. Stevens had made the same determination; from an apprehension that the names of persons, who might be supposed more than ordinarily conversant with the subject of these MSS might give a countenance to them, to which from the secrecy that was observed relative to their discovery, they were not intitled." " I was unwilling that my name should directly or indirectly give the smallest sanction to these papers."

Upon this arrogant remark of Mr. Malone, I have only to observe, that had I imagined that Mr. Malone's inspection of them would have given any sanction to the papers, I should certainly have deemed it advantageous to my own interest to have invited him. But Mr. Malone, and I are of a different sentiment with regard to the sanction, which his inspection would afford them. Of Dr. Farmer I had a different opinion, and I was desirous he should examine them. Dr. Parr wrote him a long letter in my house, pressing him to come to London for this purpose, and urging him to view the papers as a duty he owed to himself and the world. I mention this to shew,

that I did not shrink from the scrutiny of those who, conversant with these subjects could have inspected them with an eye of intelligence.

But, in point of fact, did Mr. Malone refuse as he insinuates, to inspect these pretended originals? I am at issue with him on the fact. Mr. Malone was not invited to inspect the MSS, but notwithstanding his assertion to the contrary, he betrayed a more than ordinary solicitude to see them, both by letter, and by the most pressing application to various persons: these solicitations were fruitless, he was informed that he could not be permitted to see the papers, nor would they be suffered to pass out of my possession into any hands; unless I should receive the commands of any part of the royal family, who might express a wish to see them.

Notwithstanding this information through another channel (that, to which he alluded in his note, p. 22), he earnestly intreated a friend to procure Lord Southampton's letter, and some of the other papers to be brought up to his house at a stated time, in order that he might compare them with other documents in his possession: requesting that his name might not even be mentioned, as having made the request.

The instrument through which this intrigue was to be carried on, was my son; and I will leave the  
conduct

conduct of Mr. Malone, in resorting to such an artifice, with no other comment, than that which must naturally arise from the mere statement of the circumstance.

From what I have said upon this topic, it must necessarily be inferred, that Mr. Malone is not always accurate in the statement of his facts. There is a similar inaccuracy in the very beginning of his work. He there states that his friend Lord Charlemont subscribed to the work, at the request of a gentleman who furnished him with a splendid prospectus of it; and “that if Lord  
“ Charlemont had known as much of it as he now  
“ does, he would not have given his name or his  
“ money to the publication.” In reply to this, I can positively assert, that I never made any personal application for subscriptions to his Lordship, or any other person whatever. The fact is, that Mr. Rowley, (I believe a member of the Irish Parliament), called upon me to inspect the papers, and requested me to put down his name as a subscriber, and the name of Lord Charlemont; at the same time this gentleman remarked that his noble friend was not a believer in the authenticity of the papers. I have stated this trivial circumstance to shew that the insinuation of Mr. Malone is not founded on truth; that his Lordship was not imposed upon by any representations, either in the prospectus

spectus or by any other channel ; but that he voluntarily subscribed, with a declaration that he was not a believer.

Before I proceed to follow Mr. Malone, according to the distribution he has made of the subject, I would wish the reader to observe the temper, with which it should seem he sat down to the enquiry. In the first pages of his work, there is as profuse a portion of egotism and vanity to be observed, as I ever remarked in any literary controversy. His own capacity, as an illustrator of Shakspeare, his own possession of the documents relative to the bard, seem to be the only standard, by which he tries the merits of the controverted papers. He seems to have entered into the dispute, as if every thing that belonged to Shakspeare was his own exclusive property ; and that any thing relative either to the life, or the writings of that immortal poet which proceeded from any other source, was an infringement of his own appropriate and incontestable privileges. He says with a modesty peculiar to himself, “ I trust  
 “ I shall not be charged with any idle vanity, a  
 “ weakness, if I at all know myself, most foreign  
 “ from my nature and disposition.” After this profession of diffidence, it is amusing to follow the critic into the minute detail with which he favours his readers, of all that he has done as a commen-  
 tator



tator of Shakspeare ; a detail, in comparison of which Mr. Vicary's panegyric on his incomparable têtes, or Mr. Packwood's eulogium on his own razors, is the very refinement of modesty and delicacy. He is perpetually ringing in the ears of the reader, the antient documents of which he is in possession. But till these documents are laid before the world, and an opportunity of examining their force, and authenticity be presented to the public, it is surely a little too unreasonable to expect that they should be allowed to be the only test, by which all enquiries of this nature are to be examined. When the twenty ponderous volumes, with which the public is threatened make their appearance, we shall then be able to judge concerning the inestimable treasures of the critic. In the mean while, the state of mind in which the author of the enquiry has entered into the investigation, must appear not to be very disinterested, when he virtually confesses that he has entered into it, on no other principle, and with no other feeling but that of an offended pride, and an unreasonable vanity, which has taught him to imagine that the very name of Shakspeare is not to be pronounced without his licence or indulgence.

I shall now follow Mr. Malone, according to the method in which he proposed to examine the subject. The first article which he has selected for

for animadversion, is what he is pleased to call the pretended letter from Queen Elizabeth to Shakspeare.

“ Wee didde receive youre prettye verses  
 “ goode Masterre William through the hands of  
 “ oure Lorde Chambelayne ande wee doe com-  
 “ plemente thee onne theyr greate excellence.  
 “ Wee shalle departe fromme Londonne toe Hamp-  
 “ towne forre the holidayes where wee shalle ex-  
 “ pecte thee withe thye beste actorrs thatte thou  
 “ mayste playe before ourefelse toe amuse usse bee  
 “ notte slowe butte comme toe usse bye Tuesdaye  
 “ nexte, asse the Lord Leicesterre wille bee withe  
 “ usse.”

Elizabeth R.

“ For Master William Shakspeare, atte the  
 “ Globe bye Thames.”

“ Thys letterre I dydde receyve fromme mye  
 “ moste gracyouse Ladye Elyzabethe, ande I doe  
 “ requeste itte maye bee kepte withe alle care  
 “ possyble.”

W. Shakspeare.

This letter Mr. Malone professes to try according to three different testimonies; the orthography



thography, the phraseology, the date, and the dissimilitude of the hand writing. But previous to his entering on the subject, according to this plan of disquisition, he indulges himself with a few preliminary remarks ; which though they are rather curious in themselves, than illustrative of the subject, it may be somewhat amusing to examine. With much solemnity we are referred to what the critic styles the archetype of this pretended letter, and the model on which it was constructed. It cannot be denied, that Mr. Malone would have made a very important discovery, had he stumbled upon any antient form of a letter, of which this letter from Elizabeth, was the indisputable imitation or counterpart. But the resemblance must be complete ; if it is not complete, no inference can be drawn from it. No loose analogies, no general similitude, nothing short of a perfect identity will justify any inference of this nature. Yet what is the ground, on which Mr. Malone supposes that this letter had an archetype or model, from which it was derived ? Why, it seems that in the year 1710, Bernard Lintot published an edition of Shakspeare's plays, and that in the preface to that publication, it was for the first time mentioned that " King James I. honored Shakspeare  
 " with an amicable letter written with his own  
 " hand, and that this letter remained long in the

“ hands of Mr. D’Avenant, as a credible person  
 “ then living could well testify.” Sir William  
 D’Avenant having died intestate and insolvent, and  
 his goods having been seized by his creditors, this  
 letter was unfortunately lost, and I fear will never  
 be recovered. Here we have the germ and first  
 principle of the letter from Elizabeth to Shak-  
 speare, now before us.

So then, because King James wrote a letter  
 to Shakspeare, it is to be inferred that Elizabeth  
 could not write one also. If Mr. Malone believes  
 that King James could condescend to write to  
 Shakspeare, surely a *fortiori* it may be presumed,  
 that Elizabeth, whom the historians describe as  
 having more condescension of manners than her  
 successor, might write to her favorite poet, in the  
 familiar terms of the preceding letter. Then our  
 critic is pleased to observe, that the fabricator of  
 these papers could have had no archetype (except  
 her sign manual), for the hand writing of Queen  
 Elizabeth; and therefore that the imitation is  
 clumsily executed. With regard to this objection,  
 I can positively assert that there are in many pri-  
 vate, and public collections, a variety of papers,  
 most unquestionably the hand writing of Elizabeth;  
 that I have in my own possession many specimens  
 of this kind; and that he must have been a very  
 stupid fabricator, who could not find autographs  
 of

of the Queen's sign manual, and execute the transcript with sufficient exactness for his purpose. But I would wish the reader to compare the autograph, which appeared in my publication, and to which Mr. Malone applies the terms "irregularity," "and licentiousness," with that which he himself has exhibited. Surely the difference is so minute that it would be the height of absurdity, to build an objection upon it. For when this fac-simile is compared with that of Mr. Malone's, there is no other difference to be found, but what might be discovered in the hand writing of any person whatever, when the difference of time and circumstances is taken into consideration. At one time, the Queen may be fairly supposed to have written with the greatest care and exactness; at another, *currente calamo*; and yet the specimens may bear a general resemblance to each other. Mr. Malone says, that he "has perused from the time of Henry IV. I will not say several hundreds, but several thousand deeds, and other MSS." But I much doubt, whether if he had seen them, he could have understood them; as I have been credibly informed that he cannot easily or readily, decypher the common hand writing even of the time of Henry VIII.

We now come to the orthography. Our critic observes that the spelling of this letter, as well as of the other papers, is not only, not the orthogra-

phy of Elizabeth, or of her time, but is for the most part the orthography of no age whatsoever. He then animadverts on the redundancy of vowels and consonants in the Shakspeare papers ; and has exhibited specimens of orthography from the time of Chaucer to near the end of the sixteenth century. In p. 74, we are favored with a list of words in the MSS that it is said are not to be found so spelt any where else. Now it unfortunately happens that in the vocabulary that follows, examples of most of them are adduced. And though Elizabeth did not spell the word *and* or *for* with the e final *ande*, *forre*, yet in a letter of hers to Mary, for which see Curiosities of Literature, vol. 2, p. 306, there are the following instances of her using the e final, and of other spelling which seems to correspond with the fac simile of her letter, *riche*, *greate*, *beinge*, *dothe*, *askinge*, *thinge*, *desiringe*, *felfe*, *wiche*, *mynde*, *towarde*, *outwarde*, *hathe*, *bothe*, *ende*, *longe*, &c. &c. I shall take the liberty in my turn, not to quote from the time of Chaucer, but to exhibit specimens of spelling during the period, on which we are immediately occupied, in which it will be observed that this redundancy of spelling, was very common in those times. In proof of this from many hundred instances the following are selected as sufficient testimonies.

The



The words marked thus \* are introduced in Malone's table of instances to prove the spuriousness of the Queen's letter, under an insinuation that they are no where else to be found. Observe, the instances here quoted are from printed books; and no doubt but in MSS of that day, many more instances might be adduced.

Adieu. From Nicol's Elizabeth's Progress, p. 2, and in Churchyard's Pleasant Comedy. My deare, *adieu*.

\* Atte. See Mason's Essay on Design in Gardening, p. 172, and 182. See also Sir Richard Guyldford's Pylgrymage towards Jherusalem, folio 43, printed 1511.

Att. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 148.

Awenfuers, (for answers). Lodge's Illustrations, vol. 2, p. 182.

\* Ande. See Percy's Ballads, 4 Ed. 1794, p. 136, and 137, and Notes in p. 94, and 95.

Ande. See Gentleman's Magazine for May 1796.

Ande. See Lodge's Illustrations, vol. 1. p. 22.

Archebishop. ditto, vol. 1, p. 301.

Broffe of doggs, (for brace of dogs). ditto, vol. 2. E 204.

Bee, (for be). Elizabeth's Progress, vol. 2, p. 60.

Bee. ditto, Pennant's London, p. 151.

\* Before. Alviarie, 1580.

Bushopp.

Bushopp. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 48

Bawbles. See Life and Reign of Richard II.  
printed in 1681, p. 228, line 17.

Baubles. See Cymbeline, and in a Note by  
Stevens to the 91st Sonnet in *Malone's own Edition*.

Clappe. Elizabeth's Translation of Seneca.  
See *Nugæ Antiquæ*.

Contempne. ditto.

Contynewaunce. ditto.

Clowdes. ditto.

Comhawendement. From an ancient MS re-  
lative to the Howard family, in the 15th, century.

Cuntree, (for country). See Lodge, vol. 2, p.  
43. From Elizabeth's own hand writing.

Clenged, (for cleaned). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 101.

Canne. ditto, p. 249.

Cuppe. ditto, p. 252.

Cownfaille. ditto, p. 188.

Coockoes. See Elizabeth's Progress, vol. 2.

\* Doe. Elizabeth's Progress, vol. 2, p. 62,  
and in State Papers, p. 316.

\* Doe. Water Poet, Pennant's London, and  
Stafford's Niobe.

Doonn, (for done). ditto, p. 316.

Doone, (for ditto). ditto, p. 155.

Daindgeroosly. ditto, vol. 3, p. 22.

Dyskreete. ditto, vol. 2, p. 67.

Dowbtte. ditto, vol. 3, p. 26.

Dyffave,



Dyflave, (for deceive). ditto, vol. 2, p. 256.

Depelyer, (for deeper). ditto, vol. 2. p. 185.

Dramme. George Gascoine's Works.

Doompes, (for dumps). ditto.

Determyneacions. Burleigh's State Papers, p.

321.

Exequuted. See Lodge, vol. 2, p. 39.

Exampell. ditto, p. 183.

Erre. ditto, p. 221.

Employe. vol. 2, Lodge, p. 162.

Ferre, (for far). ditto, p. 5.

\* Forre. See the Flores of Ovide, printed in 1513, and Waldron's Literary Museum, printed in 1792,

Forbydde. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 250.

Fowerttien, (for 14). ditto, p. 144.

Faythebrekyng. vol. 3, p. 59.

Farre. See Conveyance from Walker to Shakspeare.

Farre. See Nicol's Progress, in Verses on the Coronation of Ann Boleyn.

Fryndeshippe. Warton's History of English Poetry, vol. 3, p. 423.

\* Goode. Lodge, vol. 1, p. 306.

Gonne. ditto, p. 47.

Gracioofs, (for gracious). ditto, p. 75.

Grace. Frequently applied to Queen Elizabeth, in Nicol's Progress.

Gemme.

Gemme. Nicol's Churchyard's Pleasant Conceits, p. 5.

Hellpe. Lodge, 1570, N. p. 25.

Huse, (for use). See a MS letter from the Mayor of Doncaster, in the Shrewsbury Papers, in the Heralds College.

Howse. Lodge, p. 38.

Horskeippar. ditto, p. 53.

Hadd anny. ditto, 120.

Horffe. Letter from the Lords of the Council to E. of Shrewsbury, 1596. Lodge, vol. 3, p. 34.

Hee. Brown's Pastorals, p. 2.

I ame, (for I am). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 32.

I moost, (for I must). ditto, p. 123.

Justyceshypppe. ditto, vol. 3, p. 27.

Jerkins of Velvet. Elizabeth's Progress, p. 53, among Remarkable Events in 1559.

Knaifferie, (for knavery). Lodge, ditto, p. 79.

Lordshyppe. ditto, p. 33.

Lieffetenant. Nicol's Churchyard, p. 35.

Myfcontentydde. Lodge, folio 47. 1559.

Mee. ditto, p. 19.

Manne. ditto, p. 249.

Mee. Taylor, Water Poet, 245

Mester for Master. Burghley's State Papers, 445.

Monneth.

- Monneth, (for month). Lodge, vol. 1, p.  
316, 343.  
Nues, (for news). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 64.  
Nuers evyn, (for new years evening). ditto,  
115.  
Nyte, (for night). ditto, 200.  
Nienttien, (for nineteen). ditto, 144.  
Noe. ditto, 161.  
Ourselfe. Henry VIII. Preface to his Seven  
Sacraments, printed by Bartelet, 1543, p. 2 and  
98.  
\* Oure. La Vieux, Nat. Brev. p. 219, 1580.  
One, (for on). Malone's Prologomena, p.  
484, vol. 2.  
Onne, (for one). State Papers, p. 166.  
\* Off. Lodge, vol. 1. 128.  
Patronne. ditto, p. 48.  
Purffe. ditto, 204.  
Putte. ditto, ditto, 250.  
Purposse. ditto, 54.  
Prycesse, (for prices). ditto, 151.  
Rangk, (for rank). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 47.  
Redynesse. Elizabeth's Translation of Se-  
neca. See Nugæ Antiquæ.  
Sonne. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 3.  
Synnes. ditto, 16.  
Shoolde. ditto, 35.  
Sowne. ditto, 48.

- Seemes. ditto, 435.
- Soomerz, (for Summers). See Gascoigne's Works. Princely Pleasures of Kenilworth Castle.
- Shee. Taylor, Water Poet, p. 258.
- Starre. Elizabeth's MSS. Pennant.
- Thenne. Lodge, vol. 1. p. 78.
- Toowardes. ditto, p. 29.
- Tenne. ditto, p. 144.
- Uppe. ditto, p. 158.
- Uffe, (for use). See Darell's Account of Grievous Vexations of seven Persons of Lancashire.
- Vertuouoofe. Lodge, vol. 3, p. 28.
- Veü, (for view). Spenser.
- Viewe. Queen Elizabeth's Progress, p. 2.
- Wytnesses. Lodge, p. 344.
- Woorffe, (for worfe). Lodge, vol. 2, p. 15.
- Woolde. ditto, p. 19.
- Warres. ditto, p. 100.
- \* Wee. Elizabeth's Progress, vol. 2, p. 62.
- \* Wee. Taylor, Water Poet, p. 195.
- \* Wee. State Papers, p. 360.
- \* Wee. Stafford's Niobe, printed in 1611.
- \* Where. See Barrett's Alvearie, 1580.
- \* Withe. Bacon's State Papers, p. 315.
- Yett. Lodge, vol. 2, p. 35.
- Yee. Brown's Pastoral, B. 2, p. 8.
- \* Yourre. 1559, see Lodge, p. 47.

If Mr. Malone wants MS proofs of a bad and indefinite mode of spelling, specimens enough may be found in his 2d vol. of Prologomena, p. 447, and in his extracts from a vol. of Henslowe's Notes, and Theatrical Accounts from 1597, to 1603.

Mulomurco, for Mulamulluco.

Spanes, for Spanish.

Malltuse, for Malta.

Poope, for Pope,

Tamberzanne, for Tamberlane.

Gelyon, for Julian.

Janeway, for January.

Burdocks, for Bourdeaux.

Konkerer, for conqueror.

Heaster, and Asheweros, for Esther, and Ahasueras.

Camdew, for Candia.

Fostosse, for Faustus.

Gresyan, for Grecian.

Umers, for humors.

Anteckes cootes, for anticks coats.

Pygge, for Psyche.

Anlhente, for ancient.

Serpelowes, for surplice.

Dowlfen, for dauphin.

Fayetou, for Phaeton,



Mought, for mouth.

Apelles, for apples.

Bengemyn, for Benjamin.

Hoate, for hot.

One, for on.

Adycians, for additions.

Hinchlow, a proper name, for Henflowe.

Fower, for four. p. 493, ditto

Twooe, for two.

From the catalogue I have given, I presume that Mr. Malone's objection to the letter of Elizabeth on the grounds of its orthography, being irreconcilable to the orthography of the age, is completely invalidated. But our critic lays much emphasis on the objectionable spelling of the word *Masterre*, and remarks that the spelling of the word at that period was *Maister*. Yet notwithstanding the decisive tone of this assertion, he himself produces an instance in p. 377, of his appendix, of its being spelt *Master*.

In the *Paston Letters*, 2d vol. p. 292, he likewise confesses that it is spelt *Masty*, and in the *Burleigh State Papers* it is *Mesler*; so that if it appears that the orthography of this word was fluctuating and variable, and depended on the habits of the different persons who used it, no positive objection against any specific mode of spelling it,

it, is at all fair or well grounded. Mr. Malone likewise remarks on the spelling of *chambelayne*, and objects to the omission of the letter *r*, observing at the same time, that if the queen had omitted any letter it would have been the *m*. I reply to this, that he ought to have known that the word was derived from the French *chambelan*, and therefore that the letter *m* could not have been omitted, as there was no *r* in the French orthography. Besides might not the *r* have been omitted by accident? As to his exception also to the spelling of *Londonne*, which he says was never so spelt, I refer him to Elizabeth's Progress, p. 231, vol. 2, where the orthography stands as in the letter *Londonne*: But there is another objection, and that it seems is a fatal one, to the unfortunate spelling of *Hamptowne*. Is it to be supposed, says Mr. Malone, that this learned queen who knew eight languages, should be such a dolt as not to know the orthography of a word so familiar to her? But, I would ask, whether a man pretending like Mr. Malone, to be so conversant in these matters, does not in some sort answer to the description of *dolt*? Who has not observed the infinite licence of orthography, which characterised our language at this period? Who has not remarked, I do not say, the numerous deformities, but the capricious diversity of spelling in almost every book

book of the time? For a striking illustration of the licentiousness of English orthography at that period, I refer to a letter (in the *Courtiers Academy* printed in 1557), written by the learned Sir John Cheeke, to his loving friend Master Thomas Hoby.

In the preface to *Upton's Fairy Queen*, is the following remark on this subject, as far as concerns the orthography of manuscripts. "The truth is, "that the printers and correctors of the press, "thought themselves much wiser in this kind of "lore, than either the poet or his editors." See also *Mason's* recent publication of *Occleve's Poems*, from a MS bought by him at Leigh and Sotheby's, in which the editor remarks in his preface, p. 17 and 18. "That there is a degree "of uncertainty in all that can be said about ascer- "taining the state of our language at former pe- "riods."

Rowe on this subject says, in his account of the life, &c. of Wm. Shakspere,—that "we are "to consider him as a man that lived in a state of "almost universal licence and ignorance, there was "no established judge, but every one took the "liberty to write according to the dictates of his "own fancy, &c. &c.

For a peculiar and indefinite manner of spelling, I refer the reader to *Queen Elizabeth's Progress*,  
by

by Nicols, where in almost every page my observations will be amply corroborated ; he produces instances in which the same word has eight different modes of orthography. In his note, p. 71, the word court is spelt in the following different modes, corte, court, coorte, courte, courght. With regard to Hamptowne, it is very singular, notwithstanding the positive manner in which Mr. Malone asserted that it was uniformly spelt Hampton, that he himself has given an instance of *Hamptown*, besides, which I have myself seen, Wintown, Cranstown, Hoptown, and Millfingtown; and it would be very extraordinary if the final e, should in this word be repugnant to the analogy of the language, when it forms the final letter of many hundreds of names of places after the syllable *ton*.

But we are now come to a misnomer, compared with which all the others it seems are trivial, that is, the spelling of Leycesterre, for Leycester. Then, to shew how fairly and legibly that nobleman always wrote his name, we are referred to the fac-simile of his autograph, given us by Mr. Malone ; but surely he would not wish us to conclude, that all the autographs of the same individual will necessarily be equally fair and legible. Are the various autographs, for instance, in the British Museum, all of them equally fair and legible ? and if one specific autograph be less legible than  
the



the other, who will infer that it is therefore a forgery? Yet Mr. Malone is completely ignorant of the mode of spelling the name at the period with which we are concerned. In page 72, he says, that the true orthography is *Leycester*; in the same page he repeats more positively still, that “ this nobleman himself always wrote it “ *Leycester* ;” again he says, in the same page, that “ he uniformly wrote it *Leycester* .” In direct refutation of these positive and dogmatical assertions, let me refer to the privy council book of that period, from which the following extracts are made, and by which it appears, that from January 19, to May 5, the name is not once spelt *Leycester* as Mr. Malone states.

19 January, 1586, E. of *Leicester*; present in council.

21 January, ditto.

22 January, ditto, and so on always the same spelling.

1 April, 1587, E. of *Leycestre*, present.

Same day, E. of *Leicester*.

22 April, 1587, E. of *Leicestre*, present.

23 April, 1587, E. of *Leycestre*, present.

25 April, 1587, E. of *Leicester*, present.

Same day, E. of *Leicestre*, present.

26 April, 1587, E. of *Leicestre*, present.

Same day, E. of *Leicester*, present.

5 May,



5 May, 1587, E. of *Leycester*, present.

18 June, 1587, E. of *Leicester*; present.

Having brought forward so many MS proofs, I shall now refer the reader to Burleigh's State Papers, p. 527, where it is spelled *Lecester*, in the same work, p. 543, it stands *Leicestre*, p. 545, it is *Lecestre*; in the Annals of Elizabeth's Reign, published 1625, it is invariably printed Leicester. To shew that it was not usual in those times to spell these names with strict uniformity, in Burleigh's Papers, p. 543, *Northfolck*, stands for Norfolk; in the same page *Norfolck*, and in the following page Norfolk, as it is used at this day. In p. 546, of the same book, Lord Shrewsbury's name is spelt *Scherusbereis*; In p. 560, he is addressed by the queen as lieutenant in her own hand, Therle of *Shrewsbery*. It would be an endless, and a very unedifying labour, to point out these varieties. It is sufficient to have cited these instances, to shew that Mr. Malone is utterly ignorant of the matters, on which he speaks with so much presumption and arrogance.

From the discussion of this curious topic which I have just closed, it will be remarked, how unsettled and capricious the orthography of our language was at the period alluded to. The specimens I have quoted, will demonstrate the absurdity

of speaking in a tone of decision on these subjects, or of drawing general inferences from specific instances.

But we are now come to consider Mr. Malone's exceptions to the *Language* and *Phraseology* of the MSS. The first peculiarity, which he notices, is the word *pretty*, which he says was not the phrase of the time. Here we have only an assertion, which like the others, that Mr. Malone's book overflows with, is of the same fallacious, and feeble nature. The word *pretty* was in general use, at this period, and is used by all the writers, who were cotemporary with Shakspeare, as well as by Shakspeare himself.

" For to a *pretty* ear she tunes her tale."

Venus, and Adonis.

" He that hath seen the sweet Arcadian boy,

" Wiping the purple from his forced wound;

" His *prettie* tears betokening his annoy,

" His sighs, his cries, his falling on the ground."

Thomas Lodge's *Scillas Metam.* 1589.

" An yvorie shadow'd front, wherein was wrapped

" Those *prettie* boures, where graces couched lie."

Ibid.

" No

“ No more my glances play with him so *pretie*.”

Ibid.

“ Too traiterous *pretie* for a lover’s *vieu*.”

Ibid.

“ Whose *pretie* tops with five sweet roses ends.”

Ibid.

“ That of their teares, there grew a *pretie* brook.”

Ibid.

“ Some *pretie* witnesse to the standers by.”

Ibid.

“ Delicious shine her *pretie* eyes.”

Ibid.

“ *Pretty* wit.”

As you like it.

A *Pretty* and Pleasant Poeme of a whole Game of Chesse, is the title of a book printed in 1597.

After these instances, especially as he allows Shakspeare, and Raleigh to have used *pretty tales*, can this critic doubt whether the epithet was applied to written compositions?

These references must be more than are strictly necessary to overthrow Mr. Malone’s exception.

But he like some unskilful horseman, it should seem, is prepared for a fall, and has provided against it. "I enter my protest" says he, "against the triumph of those, who may produce antient examples of the usage of words to which I object." This is curious. He attempts to prove the spuriousness of the MSS, by shewing that the words used in them, were not the words or phrase of the period to which the papers are attributed. Yet he enters his protest against every argument that upholds the opposite position. An ingenious mode of logic truly, and one that is calculated to save a world of argument on every subject to which it is applied. But let us hear his own justification of it. "If" says he, "out of four objections, only one should be found incontrovertible, it will establish the spuriousness of the piece as well as four hundred." Surely it cannot be expected that a serious answer can be given to such a gross, and palpable absurdity; especially where it has been shewn to be impossible, that any reliance can be placed upon any such objections. A crown lawyer who on a case of high treason, after calling a list of witnesses in support of the charge, all of whom had been proved contradictory, and incompetent, would surely be extremely ridiculed if he were to exclaim; that if one witness could be produced whose evidence  
could



could not be disproved, the contradictions, and perjuries of the others were to have no weight at all with the jury.

Then our critic proceeds to start objections against the words *complement*, and *excellence*. With regard to the former, he objects to its use as a verb active, which he says " was never known in " this sense, in that age, nor for some time afterwards." In refutation of this, I would refer the reader to Florio's Italian Dictionary, 1611, where it is plainly used as a verb active; *complementare to complement*, and *compire to use complements, or ceremonies*.

Mr. Malone observes on this topic, that till some instance be produced against him he has a right to assume that it did not exist. I have here adduced a decisive evidence of its existence. By the same right, and on the same principle the public are threatened with an edition of Shakspeare in *twenty volumes*, where perhaps, after filling up whole pages with useless references as he has done here, it will end in an avowal of his ignorance, and the text will be left to some plain and unsophisticated understanding to restore what has been defaced by the presumptuous ignorance, and unfeeling drudgery of the commentator.

Now for the word *excellence*. Mr. Malone denies that it signified the purity or goodness of  
written



written compositions. But if the reader will turn to Barrett's *Alvearie*, 1580, and to Florio already quoted, he will see that the word is unquestionably, used in the sense to which he objects; and surely if the epithet has this signification, it is the height of absurdity to suppose that it might not be applied to written compositions, as well as to any other substantive to which adjectives are usually applied: I will however produce another instance in the second song in Brown's *Pastorals*, where he speaks decidedly of the *excellence of art*.

In the *Overthrow of Stage Plays* in 1600, p. 25, we are told that " Nero being tickled with  
" desire of prayse, and loving to heare men ap-  
" prove his playing on the stage with clapping of  
" their hands and crying out *excellent. excellent!*"

Two months after the publication of Mr. Malone's mass of *hyper-criticisn*, he corrects himself in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, as to the word *excellence*; and declares that " he had, had reason since  
" to believe that the word was thus used in Shakspeare's time." It is surely a singular circumstance, that the critic after asserting in the most decisive tone that the word was not used in the above sense, should without any apology or confession of his own rashness, retract his assertion. It puts us in mind of the gentleman mentioned in the  
Spectator,

Spectator, who knocked a man down in the street, and then very civilly begged his pardon.

The next objection is to the word *ourefelfe*. He says that when used with the personal pronouns or pronominal adjectives, it was always written separately. I shall cite instances as usual to refute the objection. *Ourselſe*. Henry VIII.'s preface to his own sacraments printed by Bartelet, 1354, p. 2, and 93. *Himself*. Argument to the first edition of Shakspeare's Rape of Lucrece, 1594. In R. Whiteford's Worke for Householders, 1530, "hide, and give most diligence to order *youreselſe* " and all youres, &c. that goth *before*." *Myselfe*, Venus, and Adonis, 1600, See Supplement to Johnson, and Stevens edition. *Thyself*, twice written in ditto, p. 441, ditto. *Themselves*, ditto, p. 411. *Itself*, Sonnets, p. 95. In Christopher Middleton's Historie of Heaven, 1596, we find "for prooffe whereof he sees how greate beasts " bow and humbly cast *themselves* at wise mens " feet."

"Then thinkes he unto *himselfe*, &c." *Hymselfe*. See Barclay's Batayle of Jugurth, 32 B.

But Mr. Malone wishes a distinction to be drawn between manuscripts, and printed books, and observes that the united words of *ourselſe* is not to be found in the manuscripts of the age. In reply, I observe that from the various citations  
I have

I have made from printed books, it may very easily be inferred, that they were joined in the manuscripts, from which the books were printed. For though in a few instances, whether from the carelessness of the compositor, or any other cause, the printed copy might differ from the MS, yet it is hardly possible to suppose that this deviation would take place in the various books I have just instanced.

What follows in the catalogue of Mr. Malone's objections, is the exception he is pleased to take against the word *amuze*, which in its present sense, he says is perfectly modern. In support of this exception, he refers us as usual, to his old friends, the dictionaries; among which he seems to have made many very elaborate researches. Then he *amuses* us with a list of names, such as Barret, Cotrave, Bullekar, and Sherrwood, in none of whose works he has been able to find the controverted word used in the sense to which it is now applied. By some singular fatality in the critical labors of Mr. Malone, he seems always to look in the wrong place, for that, which perhaps when he looks after, he wishes not to find. For had he turned to Florio's Italian Dictionary, which I have before had occasion to quote, he would have seen the word with the very sense annexed to it, which he so positively says did not belong

long to it at that time. “ To *amuse, trattenere, tener a bada.*

Before I close this topic, I cannot refrain from indulging myself in a single remark, on the habit so peculiar to Mr. Malone, of citing dictionaries and lexicons in support of his objections. He seems to have paid more devotion to Barret, Cotgrave, Cawdrey, Bullokar, Sherwood, Cockram, Philips, Cole, and Kersey, than to the Nine Muses : and he looks on their works as authorities, from which no appeal can possibly be had. But it requires little reflection to know that these authorities are at best defective ; they cannot contain all the varieties and obliquities of language. Of some, the works were professedly confined and partial ; and others brought to the task, scanty and imperfect materials. The best dictionary does not contain all the words in ordinary and vernacular use ; and so vast is the extent of human diction, and so inadequate is the industry of man to traverse the whole field of language, that the most sagacious of them all have complained, that their labour is frequently circumscribed, and their purposes perpetually defeated. Mr. Herbert Croft says, that Dr. Johnson, who is the best lexicographer the age has produced, has omitted thousands of words, not merely of different significations. I have made this observation to shew, that if Mr.



Malone is successful when he refers to dictionaries in support of his objections to the use of words, the authority on which he attempts to refute is sometimes questionable, and always imperfect. But I have done more than this. I have shewn even from the dictionaries, to which he is so fond of appealing, that the words he excepts against, are uniformly used in the very sense which he denies them.

We are now to consider, what our critic calls the incongruous circumstances attending the letter, the superscription, the negative date, &c. First he objects to the superscription. "For Master  
" Wm. Shakspeare atte the Globe by Thames."  
" So that" he says, in a style of banter, " the  
" messenger was to find out on which side of the  
" Thames, north, or south, the theatre lay." Surely there is something too frivolous in this objection to be noticed with seriousness; for was it at all more necessary that the superscription of her majesty's letter should minutely point out the side of the Thames to which it was directed, than that a letter to David Garrick, should have been superscribed to Drury Lane Theatre on the east side of Brydges Street. With regard to the negative date of this letter, though I can positively assert that there never was a date upon it, as has been maliciously insinuated, it is only from conjecture that I ascribe



to it, that of 1588. It has also been insinuated that Lord Leicester was dead, when this letter was written. It will be observed however, that this is mere conjecture. I have also my conjectures on the subject. The public will judge which is the most probable. In 1587, Lord Leicester went out a second time to the Low Countries, for the purpose of raising the siege which was then carrying on against Sluys. He returned it is well known, in disgrace with the privy council, on account of the miscarriage of his enterprize. But a short time after he was restored to the favour of her majesty. In July 1588, when the Armada arrived in the channel, Leicester was appointed general at Tilbury fort, commanding 1000 horse, and 22000 foot. After various engagements from 12th July, to 31st of the same month, the Armada was dispersed and pursued by the English. Soon after this defeat, the queen went to St Paul's in public procession; and general thanksgivings were offered up in commemoration of that glorious event; and there is every reason to conclude, that she was not inattentive at that period to her favorite amusement, theatrical exhibitions.

If any authority is allowed to the memoirs of Robert Cary, E. of Monmouth, in Nicol's Elizabeth's Progress, it seems “ that plays, masques, and “ tournaments were small branches of those many

“ spreading allurements, which Elizabeth made  
 “ use of to draw to herself the affections, and ad-  
 “ miration of her subjects. She appeared at them  
 “ with dignity, ease, grace, and affability.” Now  
 from every authority it appears, that the Earl of  
 Leicester, from that time July 31st, was in perfect  
 health, and continued so to the period of his death,  
 which, according to D’Arcey in his History and  
 Annals of Queen Elizabeth, happened on the  
 14th of December, 1588. Stowe’s Cronicle how-  
 ever, published in the year 1590, says, “ on the 4th  
 “ of September, 1588, deceased Robert Dudley,  
 “ Earl of Leycester, Lord Steward of her Majesty’s  
 “ Household, &c. &c. at Cornbury in Oxford-  
 “ shire, from whence he was conveyed to his cas-  
 “ tle at Kenilworth, and from thence to Warwick,  
 “ where he was honorably interred.” Admitting  
 therefore that he died on the 4th of September,  
 there was a sufficient interval of time, for his usual  
 attendance on the Queen at theatrical representa-  
 tions. Upon the hypothesis of the date 1588, a re-  
 ference to Aggas’s map of London in 1568, to  
 Vertue’s map in 1560, and to that of Braun, and  
 Haugenburgius in 1573, proves nothing to the  
 purpose. Yet I might refer to a map published  
 by Mr Pennant in his History of London, which  
 is a copy of one published in the year 1563. In  
 this map, there is to be seen on the Bank-side, a  
 theatre,

theatre, which is set down as “ Shakspeare’s play-house.” Now though this is evidently an anachronism, (Shakspeare not being born till 1564), yet it appears that a theatre stood which exactly corresponds to the place, where the Globe Theatre is supposed to have been built.

In order to corroborate his reasonings our critic states, that “ he discovered a contract made “ the 8th of January 1599-1600, between Philip “ Henslowe and Edward Alleyn the player, on the “ one part, and Peter Streete a carpenter on the “ other, for building the Fortune Play House, “ near Golden Lane, which ascertained the dimensions and plan of the Globe Theatre, there “ called the late erected Play House on the Bankside, &c. &c. and I have lately discovered” he continues, “ a bond executed by Burbage the “ player to this very Peter Streete, on the 22d “ Dec. 1593.” So then, the whole reasoning comprehended in this detail, is nothing more than this! Peter Streete a carpenter, in 1599, entered into a contract with Henslowe, and Alleyn, to build the Fortune Play House. It is asserted, that this very carpenter in the year 1593, had executed with Burbage of the Globe Theatre, a bond for performance of covenants. It is likewise asserted, that the articles of agreement referred to in this bond, *probably* related to the building of the  
Globe

Globe Theatre, and might fix the building of it at 1593 or 94. Now it is very obvious, *that* is, a reasoning *ex hypothesi*; which is equally the privilege of both parties on controversies of this nature. These articles of agreement might relate to any other concern in the life of Burbage, as well as to his connection with this theatre; or it might relate to the repairs of the theatre, or to any other transaction of the same nature. But all that I wish to shew is, that amidst such a variety of conjectures, the conclusion of Mr. Malone, that "the Globe Theatre did not exist at the time to which this letter must be referred," is wholly unauthorized and unfounded.

We have also some curious objections to the use of the word *theatre*, on the grounds of its not being a word of the age. He says that it should have been called the Globe Play House, not the Globe Theatre. But I could produce innumerable illustrations, to falsify this assertion, not only from his cotemporary writers, but even from Shakspeare himself. In this instance better authority indeed cannot be produced, than from Mr. Malone's Prologemena, vol. 2, p. 162, &c. where, in Stockwood's Sermon, published 1578, cited in a note, on the subject of the Curtain Theatre, it is said "I know not how I might with the godly learned, especially more discommend the gorgeous



“ geous playing-place erected in the fields, than  
 “ to term it, as they are pleased to call it a *The-*  
 “ *atre.*” Again Mr. Malone says in the same page  
 of his *Prologemena*, that there were seven principal  
*Theatres*, and four that were called “ public  
 “ *Theatres.*” We refer him likewise to his own  
 notes *Passim* for the general use of the word.

“ As in a *Theatre*, the eyes of men,  
 “ After a well grac’d actor leaves the stage,  
 “ Are idly bent on him, that enters next,  
 “ Thinking his prattle to be tedious, &c.

Richard 2d. A. 5. S. 2.

“ This wide and universal *Theatre*  
 “ Presents more woeful pageants, &c.  
 As you like it.

So Master Reynold’s answer unto Master D.  
 Reynolds, concerning *Theatre* fights, stage playes,  
 &c. printed 1600. Again in the same book,  
*Theatres*, fights, and playes, p. 1, Lord Bacon  
 also uses it in the disputed sense. “ So as they all  
 “ stood up as in a *Theatre*, viewing this fight.”

We are next told that the queen could not  
 possibly have been at Hampton Court during the  
*holy-dayes*, which were generally the times of  
 theatrical exhibitions. Those holidays are stated  
 by



by Mr. Malone, to be Christmas, Twelfth-tide, Candlemas and Shrove-tide. But it might be asked, were there no holidays in Bartholomew-tide? And is it unreasonable to suppose, that the queen gave orders for the acting of plays during that festival, which was celebrated in the month of August?

Our critic proceeds to assert that the residence of the queen is ascertained by the registers of the privy council. Now, says he, "From the beginning of December, 1587, to the 8th July 1588, she resided at Greenwich. On that day she went to Richmond, where she remained to the end of July." Now what appears from the Privy Council Books? Allowing that she was at Greenwich on the 26th of December, 1587, she was at the Star Chamber, the 6th of February, 1588, on the 16th of April, she was at Hackney; on the 14th of July, 1588, she was at Richmond; and on July the 31st, at St. James. These statements which I have faithfully taken from the Privy Council books, wholly disprove the assertions of Mr. Malone. But his grand argument is, that during these periods, her majesty was not at Hampton. But surely, it cannot be denied, that the queen might have commanded plays to be acted at other times, as well as at the festivals, enumerated by  
Mr.

Mr. Malone, allowing for the sake of argument, his statements to be correctly made.

The next objection is, that the great poet, at the time to which this letter is referred, is supposed to be an established actor, and the manager of a troop of actors. And then it is said, “ that his “ first excursion to the metropolis could not have “ been before 1586, or 1587.” Granting this statement to be correct, it will be seen that he was now twenty-four years and a half old, being born in April 1564. Now what reason is there to conclude from any thing that appears in the history of his life, that at this age, his talents as an actor had not attracted the notice and received the patronage of his royal mistress? Then it seems our commentator has written an history of the English stage, in the future edition of which it will be shewn, that it is highly improbable that Shakspeare should have produced a single drama, till some time after the period of 1586. Granting this probability to be well founded, does it necessarily follow, that he had not the management of the theatre at the time alluded to, or that he had not written the pretty verses to Elizabeth, to which her majesty’s letter refers?

But to shew that our bard had not written any of his sublime productions at the above period, it is observed, that none of his works are alluded to

F

by

by Nashe, or Puttenham; the former of whom was the author of an epistle to the universities, in which he reviews all the celebrated poets of the time, and the latter of the art of poetry; and that by neither of these writers, who published in the year 1589, is Shakspeare at all referred to as a dramatic poet. In reply to this, I observe, that no omission of this nature in the works of coteremporary writers at all proves that Shakspeare was not an author of reputation at that time, because there are many instances in which similar omissions and equally remarkable may be observed; it is an extraordinary circumstance, that Brown in his *Britannia's Pastorals*, published 1613, in the very zenith of Shakspeare's reputation as a dramatic poet, should have given a panegyrical enumeration of all the principal poets who flourished about that time, should not have once mentioned the very name of our immortal dramatist. He begins with Sydney, p. 36, folio edition; then alludes to Chapman, with the eulogium of "*learned Shepherd*;" next Drayton, as a "*Second Ovid*;" Ben Johnson, he characterises thus,"

"Johnson, *whom not Seneca, transcends his*  
"*worth of praise.*"

"He likewise mentions Daniel, Brooke, Davies, Withers, &c. &c.

But

But in this catalogue of poetical personages, the name of Shakspeare is not once alluded to. It is no less extraordinary, that Sir William Temple, the most accomplished writer of his age, in his enumeration of the epic poets of modern Europe, had entirely overlooked the immortal name of John Milton. In one word, no truth is more completely demonstrated to those who have made these researches, than the scantiness and barrenness of materials relative to the biography of Shakspeare's time, and nothing seems to me a more convincing proof of it, than this circumstance; that after all the enquiries which have been directed to this subject, we know so little of Shakspeare's theatrical life, that we are not even informed about the characters, in which he appeared on the stage.

In a style of banter, with which Mr. Malone is sometimes disposed to diversify, though it does not embellish, the serious dullness of his work, that the note annexed by Shakspeare to the letter in question, "is more like the punctilious exactness of a merchant, or attorney, than the well known negligence of the modest and careless Shakspeare." But the critic should have known, that this paper was in itself of a curious nature; that the most negligent person, who had received a let-



ter from his sovereign, would naturally treasure it up as a valuable token of royal condescension, and as the most flattering tribute, that could be paid to the genius of an author.

Of the same nature is the remark, that it is improbable that the "*pretty verses*," should have been lost, while the prose was so carefully preserved. The observation is so very frivolous that it can scarcely affect the question before us. But it is surely the very climax of folly, to form any conjectures concerning the loss of papers, or their preservation. Shakspeare might probably set an higher value on the prose of his royal mistress, than on his own poetry; and the piece, which he addressed to her, though expressed in a complimentary style, might be of so slight a nature, that neither Shakspeare himself, who was uniformly negligent of his poetical reputation, nor any of his contemporaries, might think it necessary to transmit it to posterity. It is idle, however to frame conjectures concerning the preservation, or loss of papers, circumstances, which are governed by causes of such various, and incidental operations.

In a note Mr. Malone has favoured the readers of his work, with a short poem addressed to Queen Elizabeth by Shakspeare, in the mock-heroic style. He has exhibited it in order to shew the world,  
that



that a critic can occasionally write verses, as well as notes. But I fear, that the tendency, the meaning, and the construction of the lines, will perplex and baffle the ingenuity of all who may attempt to find either tendency, meaning, or construction in them. This is surely very gratuitous folly in the commentator. No one called for the display of poetical talent in a man, whose province is as remote from poetry, as the notes which he fabricates, are foreign from the inspiration of the text he attempts to illustrate. Why should he have leaped over the fence, which has hitherto secured the sacred ground of poetry, from the unhallowed intrusions of those, who labour in the humble, though useful departments assigned to compilers and commentators?

“ But,” says the critic “ in the name which “ has been exhibited as the hand-writing of the “ queen, there are no less than six gross errors. Now reader, what is the first error? Why, “ that “ it is too small for the period, to which it must “ be referred.” Here then we see the wonderful art of the critic exhibited to perfection. At the distance of two centuries he can ascertain the gage and dimensions of a signature; and with a nice and accurate measurement, fix the precise period at which it was written, by the size and bulk of the letters. Mr. Malone is possessed of her majesty’s

majesty's autographs in the first, fifth, tenth, and fifteenth years of her reign; and it appears from these, that her hand-writing gradually enlarged as she advanced in life, and that in the year; 1587, or 1588, it was at least a fourth, perhaps a third larger than when she came to the throne. God save the mark! and could not this ingenious critic by the same rule, ascertain the size of that of her maids of honour, and ladies of her bed chamber, and fix its progression, and dimensions, as they advanced in life? But to speak seriously. How is it possible to decide on the exact size of a hand-writing of any person, and by that fix the exact period of his life at which it was written?

The second error, is that the autograph inclines sideways, whereas the genuine autograph is *bolt upright*. Here the critic again resorts to his wonderful rule for measuring her majesty's autographs. Now it happens unfortunately, that Mr. Malone's specimens of the autographs are not *bolt upright*, and, if as he remarks, the flourish is always observed under the first letter, in order to make a complete E, how comes it, that in the Museum Vespasian, P, there is a letter from the queen with her signature, of which the flourish does not intersect the letter, and leaves it therefore as complete an F as in the fac-simile of the Shakspeare MSS. I have in my possession eight unquestionable autographs of  
this

this princess, to official papers, in which this flourish uniformly intersects the first letter. I mention this circumstance merely to shew, that as it is so notorious that she was accustomed to write her name in the method alluded to, that if the imputed forger had followed any model, (and how could he have forged her name unless he did), that the particularity must have necessarily struck him.

Now we come to the fourth blunder, viz. in the *a* of the autograph. I can scarcely condescend to remark on an objection which is so minute and frivolous, that it almost implies a degradation of understanding to have discerned it. Let me quote the passage. “ In the early part of her reign she  
“ formed the direct stroke of that letter like other  
“ persons: but by degrees it became higher than the  
“ circular part; nor was it ever open or looped at  
“ the top, &c. &c. This exquisite minuteness of  
remark, is highly amusing in our commentator; it reminds us of Malvolio, who was not in the least more accurate in the discovery of his lady’s hand-writing.  
“ By my life this is my lady’s hand: these be her  
“ very c’s, her u’s, and thus makes she her great  
“ P’s; it is in contempt of question, her hand.”

Of the same nature are the other objections which follow, relative to the *b* of her majesty’s hand. The argument has nothing in it that makes an appeal to the taste, curiosity, or judgment of the  
reader

reader. I shall dismiss it with a very little comment. I would, however, ask how any critic can ascertain the precise form, in which an individual writes a name, or frames a word, and lay down a peremptory and determinate opinion upon such a subject. He who writes his name at one time in one manner, will write it again in another; and I believe, that it is absolutely impossible, that the same words, or letters should be framed in exact resemblance to each other, in the ordinary habits of writing. When we write our names, we do not make fac-similes from any preceding model: besides the whole weight of the objection, will overthrow the argument which Mr. Malone labors to establish; for had the specimens exhibited in the Shakspeare MSS, corresponded with such minuteness, to the uniform, and well known signatures of Queen Elizabeth, these would be *prima facie*, a presumption of fraud. The queen never wrote her name at different times, in the same form and modification of the letters. It is impossible that she could. But if the autographs ascribed to her, should be found exactly in size and form, to answer to any specific specimen of her sign manual, it would necessarily give birth to a suspicion of imposture and fabrication. I remember the trial of a disputed will, where in answer to a claim that was set up, it was observed  
by



by the council, that the name in the will so exactly corresponded to the known method in which the deceased wrote his name, that no further objection could be had to it. In reply to this, it was very judiciously remarked on the other side, that the very circumstance alledged to be in favor of the will, was totally destructive of it; inasmuch as no person ever wrote his name twice exactly in the same way. In support of this remark, a person in court was desired to write his own name several times on a sheet of paper, which he did, and on presenting it to the bench, the deviation was so very obvious, that the will was entirely set aside upon the very grounds, which appeared so incontestably in its favour.

But before I close this part of the subject, I will just advert to the alphabet adduced by Mr. Malone in his first plate. Now in this very alphabet it is observable that the letters deviate materially from the two extracts made from the Cotton MSS, in the Museum. In the same extracts the letters differ from each other; particularly the letter (t), in which there are no fewer than five obvious deviations. The extracts also differ from the letter of the queen in the Herald's College, nor do they differ less from one written by her, before she came to the throne, in the Museum. See Vespasian, f. 3. p. 20. I would here admonish



Mr. Malone, when he publishes any future fac-similes, to be more correct in copying from the originals before him ; because the slightest inspection will convince any one who compares them, that he has been intentionally incorrect in the fac-simile he has published.

Our critic, it must be observed in exhibiting these comparisons, takes it for granted that the specimens he displays are genuine. But I have reason to entertain doubts concerning their authenticity. When I inspected these papers in the Museum, in the presence of a gentleman universally allowed to be a competent judge of these matters, we urged an objection before two other official gentlemen who veried as they may be supposed to be therein, were not at that time able to answer. The objection was, that the letter N beginning, " I thanke you good Harry," &c. &c. discovered a reverse, or an impresson on the blank page opposite to it against which it was folded, of the whole body of the letter, as well as the queen's signature. This appearance, certainly a very extraordinary one to be produced by common ink, is not only observable in the body of the letter, which was prepared by a clerk, but also in the signature ; so that if this is to be considered as a genuine instrument it is evident, her majesty and the secretary or clerk must have used the same ink ;

ink ; which is not very easy to suppose, even if the ink were such, as was ever known to be in common use. Another objection to the opinions of Mr. Malone, as to the authenticity of these papers, is, the circumstance of the letters being placed in a collection of a totally different nature, and called “ The Book of Border Matters till the “ year 1583.” The last objection is, (and it is a material one), that there is written in one of the leaves, “ *One of the bundles I bought of Mr. Phillips.*” Who this Mr. Phillips was, probably we shall be informed by Mr. Malone, upon some future occasion. Perhaps he was one of the friends, who corresponded on matters of antiquity with Sir Hans Sloane, and received from his credulous employer, commissions similar to those alluded to in an ingenious epistle, addressed some years ago to that great antiquary.

### An Epistolary Letter to Sir Hans Sloane.

Since you, dear doctor fav'd my life  
 To bless by turns & plague my wife,  
 In conscience I'm oblig'd to do,  
 Whatever is enjoin'd by you :  
 According to your own command,  
 That I should search the western land,  
 For curious things of every kind,  
 And send you all that I could find.

I've ravag'd air, earth, sea, and caverns,  
 Men, women, children, town, and taverns,  
 And greater rarities can shew,  
 Then Gresham's College ever knew;  
 Which carrier Dick shall bring you down,  
 Next time his waggon comes to town.

First then observe, and you shall see  
 A very, very rarity;  
 It is the true authentic score,  
 On which King David us'd to pore,  
 And gain'd such wond'rous approbation,  
 He was first fiddle of the nation.

I've got three drops of that same shower,  
 Which Jove in Danaës lap did pour,  
 From Carthage brought, the sword I'll send,  
 Which brought Queen Dido to her end.  
 The stone whereby Goliath died,  
 Which cures the head-ach, well applied.  
 The snake-skin, which you may believe,  
 The devil cast, who tempted eve.  
 A fig leaf apron, 'tis the same,  
 That Adam wore to hide his shame,  
 But now wants darning; I've beside  
 The blow by which poor Abel died;  
 A whetstone worn exceeding small,  
 Time us'd to whet his scythe withal.  
 The pigeon stuff'd, which Noah sent  
 To tell him when the waters went.  
 A feather from the honest raven,  
 That brought Elijah scraps from heav'n.  
 A bull-rush taken from the cradle,  
 In which young Moses us'd to paddle.

St. Dunstan's tongs, which story shews,  
 Did pinch the devil by the nose.  
 With a knife-point full of that salt,  
 Lot's wife was turn'd to, for the fault,  
 Which since is grown so very common,  
 Who has it not, cannot be woman.  
 The very shaft, which all may see,  
 That Cupid shot at Anthony;  
 And which above the rest I prize,  
 A glance of Cleopatra's eyes.  
 Fringe work compos'd of those rich threads,  
 Broke at the loss of maidenheads;  
 Rare, curious things, by Leicester seen,  
 And shewn him by a virgin-queen;  
 At least to him or Howard shewn,  
 Things never heard of ———  
 Some strains of eloquence, which hung  
 In Roman times, on Tully's tongue;  
 Which lay conceal'd, and lost had been,  
 But Cowper found them out again;  
 A goad which nightly us'd will prove,  
 A certain remedy for love.  
 As Moore cures worms in stomachs bred,  
 I've pills cure maggots in the head,  
 With the receipt too, how to make 'em,  
 To you I'll leave the time to take 'em.  
 I've got a ray of Phœbus shine,  
 Found in the bottom of a mine.  
 A lawyer's conscience, large and fair,  
 Fit for a judge himself to wear.  
 I've a choice nostrum, fit to make  
 An oath a church-man will not take;



In a thumb-phial you shall see,  
 Close cork'd some drops of honesty ;  
 Which after searching kingdoms round  
 At last were in a cottage found ;  
 An antidote, if such there be,  
 Against the charms of flattery.  
 I han't collected any care,  
 Of that, there's plenty ev'ry where ;  
 But after wond'rous labor spent,  
 I've got one grain of rich content.  
 It is my wish, it is my glory,  
 To furnish your nick-nackatory ;  
 I only beg, whene'er you shew 'em,  
 You'll tell your friends, to whom you owe 'em ;  
 Which may your other patients teach,  
 To do, as has done.

Yours,

T. H. (edges.)

We now return to the critic, whose next topic relates to "EXTRACTS FROM MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS, A NOTE OF HAND, AND A RECEIPT." Under this head we have a most curious disquisition concerning the spelling of the poet's name. "The fabricator of these papers is said to have been led into his mistake by *Mr. Steevens*, and *Myself*." Then we have a long and as usual a very tedious story about this mistake ; *how* in the year 1776, *Mr. Steevens*, and *Myself* traced the three signatures in the will ; *how* two of them appeared

*Shakspere*,



*Shakspeare*, but a third appeared to have an *e* in the second syllable. “ *Accordingly we have so exhibited the poet’s name ever since.* I had no suspicion,” says the critic, “ of my mistake, till about three years ago, &c.” From this statement, it seems that these stupendous critics reposed on this error for near twenty years, till after having deluded the public during that period, and receiving the hint from another person, one of them resolves to examine the original (which he might and ought to have done before) again, and this enquiry putting it once more into his brain, to ascertain his error, *if any error there was*, relative to the name, before he published his new edition of *Shakspeare*.

Then the commentator, on an inspection of some papers, recently discovered by Mr. Albany Wallis, appears to have rectified his mistake, and allows that the name should be spelled *Shakspeare*. Yet notwithstanding his having set himself right in his mistake, with an instinctive predilection for his own blunder, he continues to write it *Shakspeare*. Why he does so, will appear for reasons assigned in “ *My life of him.*” Still “ harping upon my daughter,” the *Twenty volumes royal octavo*. Upon the whole it must appear that the manner of *Shakspeare’s* spelling his own name rests only on grounds of probability. For when we consider,

as I have more than once been obliged to remark, the extreme licence which at this period, and for some time after prevailed in the orthographies both of MSS, and of printed copies ; it is scarcely possible to pronounce upon this subject. In proof of this, I refer the reader to his will in the Prerogative Office, in the body of which it will be seen that his name is thus spelt *Shackspere*. But surely it is the most provoking effrontery to assert, that the necessary consequence of his having three or four years before his death, written his own name *Shakspere*, is a certain proof of the forgeries of the papers ; when we know that during his life, his coteremporaries always spelt his name Shakespeare, and that he himself from the year 1594, till his decease, used the same orthography in each of the various editions of his *Lucrece*, and his *Venus and Adonis*. But continues our Critic, “ whether “ I am right or wrong, it is manifest that he “ himself wrote it *Shakspere* : ” yet let us hear the conclusion : The conclusion is, that those papers in which a different orthography appears, must be forgeries. I answer that the papers are not forgeries, because the orthography in this respect is different. The reason why Mr. Malone himself, maintains his former spelling, is that there is no original

original Manuscript letter, of his name. If therefore there is this incertitude concerning the name, who can put his finger on any specific spelling of it and say that is not the genuine one ? I may say, in the same words which Mr. Malone has used, in justification of his own spelling, that when any original letter or MS of Shakspeare's shall ever be discovered, then and not till then, will the orthography in my MSS be disproved.

In p. 121, Mr. Malone says, that his engraver desired him to furnish him with an archetype for one of the concluding letters, viz. (r): and that he inadvertently took down the first MS that came to hand, and pointed out to him a German (r). Here we see, that Mr. Malone himself can be occasionally guilty of interpolation, though he has so thorough an abhorrence of Forgers; he takes down an old German MS, in order to furnish a fac-simile of Shakspeare's hand-writing!! Now with regard to the use of the Chancery r in the Shakspeare MSS of which he complains; he says, " that now and then, a signature may be " found in which it occurs; but in the ordinary " or secretary hand I have never met with it." He has never met with it. This is admirable ! And how is the reader to estimate this sort of reasoning ? Every one who has examined the topics, on which I have been speaking, must have had

H

abundant

abundant proof of the slender claims which this critic has to a blind confidence in his own opinions, and assertions.

For the long or chancery r, *as he has never met with it*, I refer him to Wright's Court-hand, Restored, (a book, the authority of which cannot be doubted) there he will find that this objectionable letter has been in constant use since Henry the fourth's time, as by reference to many records of more antient date, it will appear to have been for many centuries previous to that period.

It is very curious, that in p. 250, he tells us, that Lowine the player, never had his name exhibited with *ine*, as the final letters. But the proof of this! Why, "*he never met with it.*" Of the critical accumulations of this gentleman in his intended life of Shakspeare, I know nothing at present, but from what he has intimated to the public, concerning them, I hope that he will not follow his old and favorite mode of reasoning, in concluding things not to be in existence which he himself *has not met with*. On this head, I shall content myself with asserting, that I have met with (what he ought to have seen) the name of *Lowine* in the list of actors, prefixed to the first folio edition of the immortal breathings of that muse, who is about to be mangled and lacerated, in twenty ponderous



derous volumes, so fully announced by the indefatigable compiler.

I might refer the reader to the different variations in the fac-similes, which the critic himself has exhibited; were I not conscious, that the labor of following Mr. Malone through the long labyrinth of absurdity, in which he involves himself and his reader, must have been already intolerable and disgusting. But what does the whole argument amount to? Why, it proves that taking for granted, that these papers are forgeries; Mr. Malone's blunders were in fact the sources, from which they were derived. What must the world think of a man, should it appear by some hidden evidence now in the womb of time, that the whole mass of papers was an imposture, when it is his own confession, that the most prominent features of it were derived from his errors?

With the same microscopic powers of criticism, our objector observes, that Shakspeare "when in health wrote a small hand, as was the general mode at that time, and that this is not the case with the forged MSS." What proof does Mr. Malone adduce? Where is it manifest that he wrote this small hand? For, that he did not write in that way, is unquestionably proved by his autographs to the will, and to those which are now in

Mr. Wallis's possession, the only genuine specimens he admits that are to be found.

We are told, that in the *projected* HISTORY OF THE STAGE, the critic has ascertained the payment of a play at court, and that the sum paid for each representation there, in the reign of Elizabeth, was no more than ten pounds. He says, that he has found this from authentic documents. To these authentic documents, however, he has forgotten to refer us. We must still give him credit, for that which in all discussions of this nature, must be held an indispensable duty; I mean, a reference to the documents, on which an assertion rests. Then Mr. Malone points out the absurdity of Lord Leicester's paying to the actors thirty-one pounds more than was charged to him. The weakness of this species of objections, which are multiplied through the whole work of our commentator, is very apparent. Was it an unusual thing, at that period, that a nobleman who lived in the magnificence and splendor of Lord Leicester, should pay for a favorite amusement, and to his favorite actor, no more, than the mere literal expences, that were incurred?

But as another denotation of forgery, it is remarked, that the poet is represented in the MSS to be so ignorant, as not to know an earl's proper title: and then we are informed, that "your  
" grace"

“ grace” is the usual mode of address to dukes ; but that the circumstance of its being applied to Leicester, is a proof of the papers being forged. But it is worth while to observe, that Mr. Malone himself readily acknowledges, that the title was not confined to dukes, but that it was applied indiscriminately to the king, and the princes of the blood. Now it should seem from this very circumstance, that the mode of address was not confined to dukes ; and we well know, that it is neither the appropriate title of king, or queen, nor of the princes and princesses of the blood ; your majesty being the style of the one, and their highnesses of the other. So, that here we have a proof of the licence, and latitude of its application ; and there is no reason to conclude, that it never was used to individuals of inferior rank, to the personages alluded to.

Besides Mr. Malone’s argument is precisely this ; that the *most common* address to peers of the degree of dukes, being that of “ your grace,” it follows that Shakspeare according to the MSS, must have been grossly ignorant of the style, in which noblemen were addressed. Now, if ever a conclusion was completely disclaimed by the premises, it is this, which Mr. Malone has hazarded. The very circumstance of, *your grace*, not being generally so applied, might probably be the reason  
of

of Shakspeare's using it here. Had Shakspeare been a courtier, and familiarized to the phrase and accents of high rank, it was surely the most innocent, and natural flattery he could use, to address his patron in a style, superior to that, which was literally appropriated to him. Or, if he was not habituated to the language of the court on these occasions (which as far as appears from his education, and life, is the most probable hypothesis), it is more likely still, that he would use the language of flattery in his address to Leicester. It was natural for him to apply a title, in which if he erred, he erred on the safe side, and which the inherent weakness of our nature would rather approve, as the tribute of a zealous though incorrect obedience, than the ill-placed compliments of untutored rusticity.

This hyper-critic now objects to a transaction in which Lowine is concerned which appears in the receipts of Shakspeare. It states, that at the time this Master Lowine was rewarded "forre  
 " his good servyces, ande well playinge, he was  
 " just twelve years of age, and does not appear to  
 " have joined the company till after the accession  
 " of King James." But as usual, Mr. Malone brings forward no proof, which unquestionably ascertains the time of his joining the company, so that no inference against the MSS is to be drawn from what  
 he



he is pleased to assert. That he might have at that time performed the part of Arthur in King John, or the Duke of York in Richard the third, will easily be admitted; or that he might have occasionally taken female characters, which we know at that time were performed by young men. Besides it appears from the MSS, that only the sum of two shillings is set down for Master Lowine, a sum, very inadequate indeed to the services of an older performer, but which on the grounds of his extreme youth, was perhaps a sufficient salary.

We now come to the note of hand of *John Hemynge*, not *Hemynges*, as our sagacious commentator has it\*.

“ One moneth from the date hereof, I doe  
 “ promyse to paye to my good and worthy freynd  
 “ John Hemynge, the sum of five pounds and  
 “ five shillings, English moneye, as a recompense  
 “ for hys greate trouble, in settling and doinge  
 “ much for me at the Globe Theatre, as also for  
 “ hys trouble in goinge downe for me to Statford.

Witness my hand, Wm. Shakspeare.  
 September the nynth, 1589.

\* See Appendix to Malone, where *Heminges*, and *Hemynge*, occur in the same deed and as the same person.

On another paper is the following receipt, which is attached to the note of hand by three pieces of wax.

“ Received of Master Wm. Shakspeare, the  
“ sum of five pounds and five shillings, good En-  
“ glish money, thys nynth day of October, 1589.

“ Jn<sup>o</sup>. Hemynge.”

As to the signature of the poet, differing in this note from the rest laid before the public, and for the “ first and last time spelt in his own genuine  
“ manner;” I have it in my power to shew many instances, in which the name is spelt in this mode, in several other papers which I have not published; I have however, amply shewn in a former part of this volume, the unsettled and indeterminate state of our old orthography; and the numerous variations, which at that time it admitted. With regard to the alledged difference of hand-writing in the signatures, the specimens will be found with a very slight examination, to differ from each other, in the same degree only as the signature of the same individual would at different times. And what stress can properly be laid upon a point so minute and frivolous as the accidental omission of the letter (r) in Stratford? Did Mr. Malone himself never omit a letter in the haste and negligence of writing?

But

But the observations, in which I shall next follow him, are very extraordinary. "Need I call your attention" says the critic, to the "sum of five guineas, here in fact, though not in words promised to be paid?" Now let any one turn to the receipt, and see how far the statement is true and correct in mere point of fact. Does it appear that the sum of five guineas is promised to be paid? The accidental sum paid for the specified services being five pounds and five shillings; who shall say, that the sum of five guineas is represented in the receipt? For instance in the extract, Mr. Malone has given us, from the Royal Household Establishments, p. 255, the joiner's fee is set down 19*l.* 19*s.* 0*d.* and the record 16*l.* 16*s.* 8*d.* Will any one say that the former of these sums represented nineteen guineas, and the other sixteen guineas and eight pence? Now unfortunately for the argument, it will appear from his own Prologomena, vol. 2, p. 254, in the account of monies received by Phil. Henslowe, that there is this statement

"26 of Desember, 1591,"

"Received at the sege of London iiii*l.*: iiis*.*: 0*d.*"

and were it not a subject beneath attention, I make no doubt, that I could produce from antient records innumerable instances of the same nature;

I

equally

equally senseless, and fatal to his own cause, is the assertion, that xxi shillings, or cv shillings was the most usual mode of writing. Now the best answer to this, will be to refer him to the Prologomena, where it appears from the same extracts, 1591, that the accounts were kept in pounds, shillings, and pence. In short, it comparatively occurs in very few instances, where the accounts kept in shillings are above the number of xx.

A great emphasis is laid on the fac-simile of Hemynge's hand-writing, which the moment he saw it, the critic instinctively pronounced not to be genuine. Then we find him groping about the Prerogative Office, where he did not find what he looked for; though as I have before observed from good authority, that had he been successful in his search, he could not have decyphered them. But we are informed, that to prove the *Hemynge* should have been *Heminges*; he was furnished from Mr. A. Wallis with a deed of John Heminges, dated Feb. 10, 1617-18, and of which he has given an autograph in plate 2, in which he has sagaciously discovered, that "there is no more similitude between the two signatures, than Hebrew, or Chinese characters have to English." And here let me request the reader to attend to this discovery, and observe the critic caught in his own net.

On Wednesday 30th of December 1795, Mr.  
Wallis,



Wallis, accompanied by Mr. Troward, requested to see me upon particular business. When they entered the room, Mr. Wallis apparently in a jocular manner, and directing his hand to his pocket, exclaimed, " I have something here that will destroy the validity of your Shakspeare papers." He then produced the deed quoted by Mr. Malone, signed John Heminges, which I observed was totally unlike the signature of Hemynges, I had laid before the public. Mr. Wallis was then shewn four receipts or memorandums, signed John Heminges, (which exactly corresponded with the hand-writing in his deed), one of which stood in this form, dated in the year 1602-3.

" Hadde fromm Master Shakspeare for use of  
" the Curtayne, the somm of fortenn shillings."

dated

Octobree 12, 1602.

These four receipts are thus indorsed, " Payde  
" as hereinn mentyonedde, Wm. S." and are wrapped in another paper, on which is written  
" Receipts forre moneyes givenne toe mee by  
" the *talle Heminge*, onne accounte o the Cur-  
" tayne Theatre."

Wm. S.

I 2

Among

Among these papers, there are at least twenty other memorandums, or disbursements of monies, in which this person, Heminges is always distinguished as the *tall Heminges* of the Curtain Theatre, from the Hemynge I have laid before the world in my publication. Besides these documents I have the same Heminges as a subscribing witness to several parchment deeds, with Shakspeare and others. Now in consequence of Mr. Wallis having in his possession the deed before mentioned, I was well aware, that it would be a high dainty to our critic, to have an opportunity of nibbling at the parchment; I therefore, requested that gentleman very earnestly, that Mr. Malone might be permitted to copy, or make any other use of this deed, that he might think proper. I was desirous also of putting some deeds of my own into his hands, which I knew he would very willingly copy as proofs against me; but out of motives of mere compassion, I desisted from my intention. Well, Mr. Wallis politely permitted him to take a copy of the deed, and in consequence, in Plate 2, No. 6, he has most assuredly given the autograph with considerable *fidelity*. It is amusing, therefore, to see him like a whale rolling about in the depths of his own blunders: and entering into an elaborate proof to shew that he s final was in common use at that time, to account for its being written *Heminges*.

*minges*. But this is another proof of his ignorance, of the orthography of proper names at that time, even as they were printed. Had he looked to the editor's dedication prefixed to the first folios, he would have there found the name thus spelled, without the s final *Heminge*. And so indefinite was the orthography at that period, that in the list of Actors in the same vol. he is called *Heminges*. In p. 140 of Mr. Malone's work, he says, that Heminge was married to Rebecca *Nuell*, widow. Now, as a proof that this ingenious gentleman cannot read, I would remark, that the original MS has it Rebecca Knell, widdow. Then in a style of banter in which he is not very successful, he attacks poor Heminge with want of gallantry in leaving his wife to go down to Statford.

Are then the attachments of our amorous commentator so closely rivetted, that in the second year of his marriage, no urgency of business should divert him from the arms and the bed of his mistress, even for a few nights? and with regard to his objection to the accidental use of Statford, I cannot help observing the curious changes which he rings upon the objectionable authority, when in one sentence he finds fault with their being redundant, at another, with their being deficient in the letters. But, as he says p. 132, " I will leave this  
to

to be determined “ by some one better versed in  
“ decyphering nonsense, than I am.”

Mr. Malone now comes to an objection, on which by the assistance of some ingenious friend, he has been enabled very amply to expatiate. Very luckily, he says, that he has discovered the form of a promissory note at that period, and as the note among the MSS does not conform in every respect to it, he very sagaciously concludes, that it was forged for the occasion. Let us observe the specimen given by Mr. Malone.

Mem. “ That I Gabrell Spencer the 5th of  
“ Aprell have borrowed of Philippe Henslowe  
“ the sum of thirtie shellynges in redy money to  
“ be payed unto him agayne, *when he shall demande*  
“ yt. I saye borrowed xxxs.

“ Gabriell Spencer.”

This is copied as Mr. Malone states, from Henslowe’s MS Register.

Then he gives an instance of a note or bill of debt, payable one month after date.

“ The x and twentieth daye of Septtember,  
“ a thousand six houndard, borrowed of Mr.  
“ Henshlowe in redii monie the som of fortie  
“ shellyngs



“ shellings to be paid the twentie daie of October  
 “ next folleinge the date herof, in witness herof,  
 “ I set to my hand.

“ John Duke.”

Another form was,—“ Received 30 die Ja-  
 “ nuarii 1598 of —— the sum of —— to bee re-  
 “ payed unto him, or his assignes upon the last of  
 “ Febuary, next ensuinge, whereof I bind me, my  
 “ heires, executors, and administrators.” None  
 of these it is said, whether entered in the book  
 of the lender, or written on separate slips of  
 paper, were indorstable over, nor could an ac-  
 tion at law be maintained on them.

To this last observation, I take no exception.  
 I do not contend that the memorandums in the  
 Shakspeare MSS were legal or transferable secu-  
 rities. All I contend for is, that there can be no  
 decisive proof that this form of acknowledgement  
 of a debt, or a promise to repay it, might not  
 have been used at that time, notwithstanding  
 what is said to disprove or invalidate it, either  
 by Mr. Malone himself, or by his ingenious  
 friend.

But the two authorities clash with each other,  
 and according to all the rules of strict reasoning,

as well as of strict evidence, are mutually destructive of the several proofs they adduce. In the elaborate history of promissory notes, which is thrown into the lumber of an appendix, instead of framing a connected system of argument in his text, it is laid down as a sort of axiom, that in the period on which we are occupied, it was essential to every instrument of this kind, that it should contain a clause to express the sealing of the paper. For instance. "In witness whereof I set to my  
"seale, &c." It is observable that this is also taken from Henslowe's Register. Now in the bill of debt, which Mr. Malone himself has exhibited, there is no such clause as this inserted, nor does it appear that the instrument was sealed by the party, who was bound by it. Here then are two contradictory authorities. The ingenious friend says that every instrument must have been sealed, and that none existed without it. The critic himself produces a specimen, where there is no clause relative to sealing at all; and what is very remarkable, both of them seem to have been exploring the same records; and each produces a specimen, which falsifies and invalidates that of the other.

Mr. Malone from the nature of his objection, appears to me entirely ignorant of the law, history, and commerce, of the country. He does not consider that the antient usages of a bill or  
promise

promise to pay, or to do any thing, because there was by statute law, no definite and prescribed form of writing them, on that very account, were by consequence uncertain and variable. He seems to suppose that the origin and use of notes was not prior to the statutes which made them negotiable, viz. the statutes 9th and 10th, William 3d, and 3d and 4th, Anne; c. 51. These statutes first made them negotiable, but it is reasonable to suppose that they were in existence before this period, as the 9th and 10th; William and Mary, c. 7; which, "is entitled an act for the better payment of inland bills of exchange," prescribes no specific form, but merely creates provisions to give them a legal negotiation and effect.

Without the aid of the dull reasoning in the appendix, I am ready to acknowledge, that the promissory note did not exist legally at this period, and I am also ready to allow, that among merchants, it was not the usual mode of giving securities, or of acknowledging debts. Among those, who were engaged in commerce, it is natural to suppose, that no instrument would be in general use, but what was recognized by law. But the same reasoning does not apply with equal force to transactions between individuals. It is stated, that the want of these promissory notes, &c. was very severely felt in the mercantile world, and

the inconvenience of sealed obligations a considerable matter of complaint. This inconvenience must have been much more severely experienced in the pecuniary intercourses of those, who did not stand in a mercantile relation to each other. By consequence therefore, some mode of acknowledging the receipt of monies on one hand, or of promising to pay them on the other, would naturally be resorted to, where a mutual confidence existed. The notes &c. in the Shakspeare MSS merely relate to a private transaction between two very intimate friends. The sums were small, and neither of the parties thought it necessary to clothe their contracts in the inconvenient shape of strict legal rules. This very often happens at the present moment. I have myself often seen the vowels I, O, U, with the sum of money annexed; and this has been the only acknowledgement between the parties, and that to a very considerable amount. As these papers are not put into circulation, they are frequently kept in a desk or drawer, by way of a mere private memorandum.

Having dismissed this topic, on which I trust that the remarks I have made, will be equally clear and satisfactory, I now proceed to the letter to Anna Hatherway. Here Mr. Malone invokes Venus, her son and all the loves, and the graces. The first time I believe, so ill-omened an invo-



invocation was ever addressed to these personages. Commentators, and critics are not in general the ardent votaries, nor the favoured choice of the beautiful divinity. Nor is it very usual to invoke the inspiration of this goddess, to subjects of recondite and abstruse researches into black letter, from whence the illuminations of genius, and taste, and science are necessarily excluded. But leaving this ridiculous topic, let us attend to the objections the critic takes to the letter, I have alluded to. The letter is as follows.

“ Dearest Anna

“ As thou haste always founde mee toe mye  
 “ worde moste trewe soe thou shalt see I havee  
 “ stryctlye kepte mye promyse I pray you per-  
 “ fume thys mye poore locke withe thy balmye  
 “ kysses forre thenne indeede shalle kynges  
 “ themmeselves bowe ande paye homage toe itte.  
 “ I doe assure thee no rude hande hathe knottedde  
 “ itte thy Willy’s alone hathe done the worke  
 “ Neytherre the gyldedd bauble thatte envyrnnes  
 “ the heade of majesty noe norre honourres most  
 “ weyghtye would give mee halfe the joye as didde  
 “ thys mye lyttle worke forre thee The feelinge  
 “ that dydde neareste approche untoe itte was  
 “ thatte whiche commethe nygheste untoe God  
 “ meeke ande gentle charytye forre thatte virtue

K 2

“ O !

" O! Anna doe I love doe I cheryshe thee inne  
 " mye hearte forre thou art ass a talle cedarre,  
 " stretchyng forthe its branches and succourynge  
 " the smallere plants frome nyppynge winneterre  
 " orr the boysterouse windes Farewelle toe  
 " morrowe bye tymes I will see thee tille thenne  
 " Adewe sweete Love.

" Thyne everre.

" Wm. Shakspeare."

" Anna Hatherrewaye."

Upon the internal style of the letter, as it is  
 natural to expect, the critic makes no observation.  
 Of the solid sense, with which it abounds, the  
 marks of a pregnant intellect which it displays,  
 and the beauty of its diction, and imagery, he  
 takes no cognizance. He is still *apud minima*.  
 With a taste similar to his, who in examining the  
 beauties of an ancient temple, should inspect the  
 stones of which it was built, and analyze the mortar  
 which cemented them together, he attempts to  
 pick out a flaw in the orthography, and super-  
 scription. Or, to use a more ludicrous compari-  
 son as Prior has it of a twelfth-cake

He is but an *idle dreamer*,

Who leaves the pye, to gnaw the streamer.

As a specimen of this " obscure diligence,"

I would

I would just point out the frivolous exception to the letter, on the score of its omitting in the superscription the usual prepositions *For* and *To*. I leave this exception without commenting upon it. Then we are told, by way of farther objection, that the lady was christened plain Anne not *Anna*; and that her name was not Hatherwaye but *Hathaway*.

I have not examined parish registers, nor looked into mouldy records, to ascertain the precise manner, in which she was christened. But this does not interfere with the argument, for names are not always pronounced with the pronunciation which was used at the christening. Besides there are innumerable instances, in which vernacular names are pronounced with a Roman termination. But this advocate for the fame of the immortal bard, according to the character he has arrogated to himself, might have recollected that names were frequently written in this mode by Shakspeare himself, in several of his dramas. Let him look to his *Taming the Shrew*.

“ Thou art to me as secret and as dear,

“ As ANNA to the Queen of Carthage was.”

Act. 2. Sc. 4.

Have we not also *Isabella*, for Isabel? *Mariana*

*riana* for Marianne, in Measure for Measure? *Katharina* in the Taming of the Shrew. *Maria* in Love's Labour Lost. Ditto, Twelfth Night. For *Anna* Queen of Great Britain, see Taylor the Water Poet, f. ed. p. 250. *Anna Maria* Estouteville, and *Henrietta Maria*, daughter of Thomas Savage, Viscount Rock Savage, both born the end of the 16th, or the beginning of the 17th century. These instances I am furnished with by F. Townsend, Esq. Windsor Herald.

Again we find in the Parish Register of St. Botolph Bishopgate, " Anna ——— one of the  
 " nunnies maides of St. Mary Spital, buried 20th  
 " of October, 1613. These instances, will I think, shew to conviction the frequent use of these names, of *Anna* in particular, of which Mr. Malone has dogmatically said that *in plain prose*, no example can be produced in the sixteenth century. Yet surely the letter to Anne Hatherwaye is not plain prose. If that can only be called poetry, which is expressed in certain metre, and cadence, this is certainly prose, and probably this gentleman has no other criterion to distinguish between poetry, and prose. But if by poetry, be meant that, which breathes inspiration, and is clothed in a sort of numerous diction though not regular versification, then the letter I am speaking of, is surely a poetical composition.

With



With regard to the exceptionable spelling of *Hatherrewaye*, I shall not trespass much on the attention of the reader, by entering into minute disquisition concerning it. This only I will remark, as far as the remark can apply to the subject of the MSS, that Ben Jonson's name is frequently written in papers which I have in my possession, Johnsonne, and even the name of Harcourt, whose name is so spelled in a printed book, intitled, a Voyage to Guiana, has in a note immediately under it, in the very hand-writing of the Shakspeare MSS, the word spelt *Harrecourte*. Now, not to lay any emphasis on the question of the authenticity or imposture of the papers, is not this unusual mode of orthography as reconcileable to the one as to the other hypothesis? for, what forger in his senses would have betrayed so gross an improvidence, as to display errors, which must have directly militated against his own purposes. And though our critic is so very confident, that the erroneous orthography of this name, is a sufficient proof of the imposture, it is no stronger proof to a candid mind than the spelling of Lowine, Leycesterre, or Shakspeare in several opposite and contradictory ways.

But, says Mr. Malone, had the address been "*my sweet Anne*," instead of *dearest*, it might have passed well enough. In support of this frivolous  
 remark,

remark, he cites Sir John Harrington, who begins his letter to his lady, dated December 27, 1602, with the words " Sweet Mall." In reply to this, I shall refer Mr. Malone to Lodge's Illustrations, where he will find in vol. 2. p. 102, in the Earl of Derby's letter, the words " Dearest Friend," used in 1589: again in the same volume p. 72, we shall find " Dearest Py." In Nicol's Elizabeth's Progress, p. 7, in Churchyard's Pleasaunt Comedie, " My Deere, adiew.

But to quit the subject, we will refer this critic to his own quotations, particularly in p. 56, where Sir Philip Sidney addresses his Sister, " *To my deare Lady and Sister the Countesse of Pembroke.*" But it is of all labours, the most wearisome, and certainly the least instructive, to occupy our understandings about such miserable trash. In a note, it is observed by the critic, that the forgery is proved by the fact, namely, of misnomers, orthographies, &c. notwithstanding the reasons that might be adduced in support of them.

Admirable reasoning! But how my good critic, is this fact proved? Is it by my Lady Barnard's Will, or by the old Parish Register, which contains the marriage of a person, who is not even known to belong to that family? Let us leave him, however, to his registers and prerogative indexes.

Now

Now with regard to the orthography of the poet's name (once more to recur to this topic) can any rational man conclude, that Heminge and Condell, the editors and printers of Shakspeare's works, were forgers; because they spelt his name *Shakespeare*? though in the only admitted autographs of the bard, he himself wrote it Shakspere and Shakspeare. And by the same reason in the instance before us; namely, the spelling of Hathewaye, can the orthography of her name; not as it was written in her own hand, but as it was found in the will of a descendant, in the third degree of generation from her; be according to any sound principles of logic; or evidence; considered as a forgery?

But not content with digressing from his subject by invocations to Venus, and the Graces; we now find our critic introducing his political opinions into the controversy before us. In truth; there seems some little ingenuity in the mode of procedure, which he has adopted. He seems to have known, that if all the researches he has expended on the subject, the minute, and laboured criticisms he has pursued, for the purpose of invalidating the MSS, should be but little attended to, and their effect on the question but slightly estimated, to introduce his political tenets, and to shew a seditious tendency in some passage of the MSS would

L

excite

excite a powerful, and efficient prejudice against them. For this purpose, he introduces himself as a zealous royalist; and has selected a passage of the above letter, to which he imputes a seditious construction. The words which he marks out as a contemptuous allusion to royalty are those of “ *gyl-dedde bawbles.*” Let me, however, request the reader to peruse the passage. None, but the most servile courtier, can surely take an exception to any phrase of this kind. In calling the crown a gilded bawble, Shakspeare only repeated, what he has frequently said in his dramas. Who is there that will mark out for animadversion every sentiment, which concerns the emptiness of royalty, and that occurs not only in this poet, but which must occur in the works of all, who have studied human life, and drawn rational reflections from the perusal of it? Who for instance, could make this objection to the speech of Richard II.

————— Within the hollow crown  
That rounds the mortal temples of a king,  
Keeps death his court, and there the antic sits,  
Scoffing his state, and grinning at his pomp, &c.

Act. 3. Sc. 4.

Still pursuing his digression, Mr. Malone attempts



tempts to give an eulogium on the character of Queen Elizabeth. As he has provoked the subject, I trust, that a slight observation on the character of this princess, will be allowed me in my turn. It is intimated by Mr. Malone, that time may have abated the splendor of her name. Perhaps there is no better proof than this, that the splendor of her character was temporary and adventitious, rather than durable and solid. The most unequivocal test, to which the general policy or personal character of a sovereign can be brought, is the estimate of a fair, and unbiassed posterity ; because it is an estimate, into which no temporary prepossessions, no heats of party, or faction can possibly enter. It is indeed somewhat remarkable that the example of this princess, whom every historian has represented to have been more tenacious, of the royal prerogative, and more avaricious of arbitrary sway, than any of her predecessors, should be held up as an object of such ardent veneration. I know not how to account for it, but by attributing it to the new fashioned propensity, not only to contemplate with complacency, but even with admiration, those periods of our history, in which the liberties of the people were the most overlooked, or despised. Mr. Malone in his abhorrence of regicide, ought not to have forgot the cruel murder of the Scottish Queen, in which a lawful

and aimiable sovereign was deposed by the artful, and jealous policy of the princess, of whom he is so violently enamoured. The reign of this queen, however, was prosperous, in the wars she entered into, and the commerce of the country was considerably extended at that period. This will account for the predilections to this princess. So true is it that a combination of prosperous circumstances, will throw a sort of magnificence over a government, the administration of which is uniformly conducted on the most arbitrary, and tyrannical principles. With regard to the " detestable doctrines of modern republicans," which our critic seems so thoroughly to apprehend, I shall only observe that if the cause of regular governments, has no better support, than the pen of an half informed and cloudy commentator, it stands in a state deplorably precarious, and dissoluble.

But to return to the verbal objections of the critic. On the use of the word " bawble," in the letter to Anna Hatherwaye, he observes, that he has some doubt, whether the word had obtained that signification, so early as the middle of the reign of Elizabeth. He doubts whether it was used at that time, though in the foregoing sentence, he allows that it bears the very sense affixed to it in several of our poet's plays. Why, however, the world is to be satisfied with the doubts of this gentleman,

gentleman, I am at a loss to discover, and I am equally perplexed to discern upon what principles his doubts, unaccompanied as they are even with the shadow of an argument, can operate against my reasonings. In p. 14. we have produced instances sufficient to shew that the word *Bawble* was in use in Elizabeth's time, and long before that period, and was applied exactly in the sense, in which it is used in the MSS. In *Cymbeline*, a play the commentator should certainly have had some knowledge of, we find

“ Richer than doing nothing, for a *bauble*,  
 “ Prouder than rustling in unpaid for silk.”

Another instance I shall here adduce, (though it is scarcely necessary) to prove the word was in very common use in 1633. In the index of words prefixed to Butler's English Grammar printed in that year, and which consists of only twelve leaves, we find under letter B. To Babble, Garrio, a *Bawble*, Nugamentum.

With regard to the objection, that *gilded* is an unsuitable epithet to diadem, and that Shakspere must have known that the diadem always consisted of real gold, I shall make but one observation. It is evident from the sense to which it is applied in the letter before us, that the epithet, “ *gilded*,” was  
 used

used in a derogatory manner, in order to degrade the value of the object to which he alludes. It is a figure in rhetoric, which Quintillian and Tully call the *imminutio*; and had Mr. Malone read the works of either of these writers, he would not surely have tried a mere metaphorical diction, by the test of rigid truth, to which it is absurd to bring either figurative, or rhetorical expression.

In order to shew, however, that the prevalent opinions of our author's age, were inconsistent with the sentiment in the letter to Anne Hatherwaye, we have many quotations from Shakspeare. But how loose unconnected extracts from various plays, can demonstrate the real sentiments of the author, I cannot discover. When Shakspeare wrote his dramas, he would naturally put into the mouths of his theatrical personages, the sentiments which were the most congenial to their respective characters. He knew, that unless he was governed by this principle, the unity of character and action, which is the most prominent merit of Shakspeare, would be violated and destroyed. He attributed, therefore, to his dramatic agents, their appropriate expressions. When a bishop speaks, Shakspeare provided him with the language of passive submission to the reigning authority which it is natural for a bishop to utter. In the lips of his sovereigns,



reigns, he has put the diction of a conscious, and dignified superiority ; in those of his courtiers, the maxims of pliant and accomodating servility. Hence it is, that in the writings of Shakspeare, it is easy to select passages, in which the most servile, and submissive principles are inculcated. But on the other hand, it is by no means difficult to find sentiments, which breathe the spirit of a proud and dignified independence. Passages of this kind may be found in Julius Cæsar, and in many other plays, where it was necessary for the preservation of that unity of character, which appears in all his dramas, that appropriate sentiments and expression should be used.

But we have also an objection to the use of the word “ cedar,” and to the phrase “ forre thou arte as  
 “ a talle cedarre stretchynge forthe its branches and  
 “ succourynge smaller plants fromme nypynge  
 “ winterre, or the boysterouse windes. It is said  
 “ that an umbrageous multitude of leaves, instead  
 “ of succouring destroys all vegetation under it.” This is not true. Mr. Malone has proved himself not only ignorant of natural history, but even incapable of the most obvious reflection. Vegetation, every one knows, requires air ; this is evident from the propensity, which naturalists have observed in all plants, and shrubs, to bend towards the air, when they are situated in places,  
 which

which do not admit a general circulation and diffusion of that fluid. But we are yet to learn, that the shelter of a tree is unfavourable to the growth of smaller shrubs and plants. Ivy, Jessamine, the Rose-tree, and Ever-greens, flourish always in the shade. This would-be critic here finds fault with what he cannot understand. I must first remind him of the maxim of the schools, "Nullum simile est idem," or to translate it to him; "That which resembles any thing, cannot be the same." If he finds fault with the above beautiful passage, what will he say to the following effort of a great master? "My love is as the cypress in the garden, like the horse in the chariots of Thessaly." I must now inform this God of Letters, that, if a resemblance is exact throughout, it is not any longer, poetically speaking a simile. Has he forgot the objection against Addison's angel, or does he not know it? Perhaps he may not. But to answer him incontrovertibly, at least in his own way, I assert, that some ever-greens and other plants will thrive beneath the shady branches of trees; and that in most counties famous for the production of apples, in order to save ground, grain is sown in the orchards, which does not seem to flourish the less from being so situated: and, last of all, he must be requested to peruse the lines in question again, and he will find,

that

that in them the cedar is supposed only to defend the smaller plants " fromme nyppynge winneterre, " or the boysterouse windes ;" and not to succour vegetation, as he misunderstood them. It is rational to infer, that when they are protected from the cold blasts, and in southern climates from the intense rays of the sun, they would be more likely to thrive in their young and tender state. That vegetation, however, does flourish under this species of covering, is evident from the immense quantity of underwood, or low shrubs, which will be observed in all woods and forests, where there is a great deal of shade, and protection afforded them by the larger trees. Leaving however, this species of digression, let us now examine the verses by Shakspeare, to Anna Hatherwaye.

" Is there inne heavenne aught more rare  
 " Thanne thou sweete nympe of Avon fayre,  
 " Is there onne earthe a manne more trewe,  
 " Thanne Willy Shakspeare is to you.

" Though fyckle fortune prove unkynde  
 " Still dothe she leave herre wealthe behynde  
 " She neere the hearte canne forme anew  
 " Norre make thye Willy's love untrue.

" Though age withe withered hand doe stryke,  
 " The forme moste fayre the face moste bryghte,  
 " Stille dothe she leave untouchedde and trewe  
 " Thy Willy's love ande friendshippe too.

M

" Though

" Though deathe with neverre faylynge blowe  
 " Dothe Manne and babe alyke brynge lowe  
 " Yette doth he take naughte butte hys due  
 " Ande strikes notte Willy's hearte still trewe.

" Synce thenne norre forretune death norre age  
 " Canne faythfulle Willy's love assuage  
 " Then doe I live ande dye forre you  
 " Thy Willye syncere ande most trewe."

The first verbal exception to these stanzas, is the use of "Heavenne" as a dysyllable. The exception is founded on the authority of Spenser. "In his letter to Gabriel Harvey, April 1580" "*Heaven* being used short as one syllable, when it is " in verse stretched with a diastole, is like a lame " dog that holdeth up one leg. In our poet's genuine compositions, we never find any such hobbling metre," observes the commentator on Shakespeare. To what purpose he has read this great master will be seen, from the specimens I shall adduce, to shew that it is used indiscriminately as a dissyllable and monosyllable in various passages of his plays.

The means, that *Heaven* yields must be embraced,  
 And not neglected : else if *Heaven* would,  
 And we would not *Heaven's* offer, we refuse  
 The proffered means of succour, and redress.

King Richard II. Act 3. Sc. 2.

— Oh !



————— Oh ! you are men of stones,  
Had I your tongues, and eyes, I'd use them so,  
That *Heaven's* vault should crack : she's gone for ever.

Lear. Act. 5.

Now let the rain of *Heaven* wet this place,  
To wash away my woeful monuments.

Henry VI. Part 2. Act. 3.

By *Heaven* I had rather coin my heart,  
And drop my blood for drachmas, than to wring  
From the hard hands of peasants, their vile trash  
By any indirection.

Julius Cæsar, Act. 4.

The Sun not yet thy sighs from *Heaven* clears.

Romeo and Juliet, Act. 2. Sc. 3.

Why e'en in that was *Heaven* ordinant.

Hamlet, Act. 5.

He finds the joys of *Heaven* here on earth.

Merchant of Venice.

I cannot 'twixt the *Heaven*, and the Main  
Descry a fail.

Othello, Act. 2.

I have tow'rd *Heaven* breath'd a secret vow.

Othello, Act. 2.

By *Heaven* I will ne'er come in your bed,  
Untill I see the King.

Merchant of Venice, Act. 5.

Study is like the *Heaven's* glorious Sun.

Love's Labour Lost, Act. 1.

These earthly Godfathers of *Heaven's* lights.

ibid.

*Heaven* would in little shew

Therefore *Heaven's* nature's charg'd.

As You Like it. Act. 3. Sc.

Hymen from *Heaven* brought her.

ibid.

Make *Heaven* drowsy with the Harmony.

Love's Labour Lost.

And Beauty's crest becomes the *Heavens* well.

ibid.

What peremptory eagle-sighted eye

Dares look upon the *Heaven* of her brow.

Love's Labour Lost.

————— In vaine do men

The *Heavens* of their fortunes fault accuse.

Spenser.

Looke when the *Heavens* are to justice bent.

Ibid.

The sunne that measures *Heaven* all day long  
At night doth bath his steeds, th' ocean waves among.

Ibid.

At last the golden Orientall gate  
Of greatest *Heaven* gan to open fayre,  
And Phœbus fresh as bridegroome to her mate,  
Came dauncing forth, shaking his dewie haire,  
And hurles his glistering beames through gloomie ayre.

Ibid.

————— Now the golden Hesperus  
Was mounted hie in toppe of *Heaven's* sheeme.

Ibid.

It was the time, when rest soft sliding downe  
From *Heaven's* height, into man's heavie eyes

Ibid.

————— Her angel's face  
As the great eye of *Heaven* shined bright.

Ibid.

What so the *Heavens* in this secret doombe,  
Ordained have, how can fraile fleshy wight  
Forecast, but it must needs to issue come.

Ibid.

Why have I quoted these instances? I have  
quoted

quoted them to shew that this gentleman, who we ought to suppose, is too conversant with Shakspeare, not to have met with these passages, has made an assertion, which every page almost of this author falsifies and destroys. It were to be wished that this critic and historian of *Lowine*, could be made to know something about what he writes, before he begins scribbling, he would then contrive to get some understanding of the author of whom he speaks. He would then know that Spenser has taken this licence in as large a latitude as any of his neighbours,

“ Like as a tender rose in open plaine

“ Dispreeds the glory of her *leaves* gaye.”

This is dilatation, this is diastole with a vengeance. But what reliance in any respect, is to be had in the genius of vocabulary and dictionary? old and new, from *Romeus and Juliet* to Samuel Johnson, he has written and read “ a world of “ wordes;” but what does he know in any respect of the use of them? that he knows nothing of the measure of either Shakspeare or Spenser, is here demonstrated, and yet he dreams that he is as familiar with them as his glove, and, as if they were sworn companions. We have seen that those who are utterly incapable of reasoning, can very glibly



glibly enumerate and run over the names of our old logicians ; and Cockeran or Coles may help him to the meaning of the words, systole and diastole, whom no schooling, no drudgery, no reading or transcribing, can make feel the harmony of numbers.

Not long after the critic's publication of his enquiry, we find him recanting his assertion, and proclaiming his ignorance through the medium of the Gentleman's Magazine, acknowledging that he recollects the use of the word in Macbeth.

“ Hear it not Duncan, for it is a knell,

“ That summons thee to *Heaven*, or to Hell.

And does this retractation atone for the temerity of making bold, and unsupported blunders, on a subject to which one might imagine from his peculiar study and avocation, he would have paid a stricter and more diligent attention. It appears rather extraordinary, that a commentator on Shakspeare, should convict himself of having never read him.

The next paper in the order pursued by Mr. Malone, is the

Letter from Shakspeare to the

Earl of Southampton ;

and the

Earl's answer.

Here

Here we come once more to assertions, urged if possible with encreased arrogance, and more destitute than ever of proof, or reason. It is said, that there is not a single circumstance belonging to these letters, that does not detect and expose the imposture. But the reader will smile, when he observes the extraordinary mode, in which this asseveration is attempted to be maintained. The reasoning is not specifically applicable to the letters before us, but comprehends the whole of the subject. It does not merely attach suspicion to this part of the Shakspeare documents, but overwhelms in one indiscriminate torrent of refutation, the intire collection of manuscripts altogether. What is this irresistible argument? Stripping it of its useless incumbrance of words, and bringing it into a narrow compass, it is precisely this. *I, Edmund Malone, having been employed on a life of Shakspeare for two years past, and with the aid of authentic and indisputable documents, (which the world has not yet seen) having overturned every traditional story, concerning Shakspeare for near a century past (which is yet to be proved) not being unconversant with the subject, do pronounce these MSS to be spurious.*

Mr. Malone is pleased to consider these letters as formed on some archetype, or received tradition concerning Shakspeare. The letters in question,

question, he ascribes to a tradition, transmitted from Sir William Davenant to Mr. Rowe, that Lord Southampton gave our author no less a sum than one thousand pounds. But how is this act of patronage and liberality disproved? Why Mr. Malone is possessed of indisputable documents, which prove what? that this liberality must have been greatly magnified, and that the story in all its parts cannot be true. Now let me request the reader to observe, in the first place that these *indisputable documents* are not produced; that according to equitable rules of reasoning, therefore they have no weight at all in the present argument. In the second place, giving the critic credit for his *indisputable documents*, and allowing that they prove the liberality of Southampton to have been exaggerated in this tradition, as far as the question relates to the letters before us, they prove nothing at all, because these letters specify no sum, but allude merely to an indefinite, though great act of bounty from the Earl to his friend Shakspeare. But it is diverting to hear the critic prescribe, in what order the correspondence would have been conducted, had the poet received the mark of munificence from his noble patron, First, says he, Lord Southampton's letter would specify the sum, which he had given, as a tribute to the talents of the great bard, and then we should have seen the

poet's letter of thanks. On what grounds, does Mr. Malone assert that such would have been the natural order of correspondence? Must it have necessarily happened, that this bounty was communicated by a letter, or if it was communicated by letter, might not this letter have been lost? But the inference which the commentator draws from the letters appearing in this order, is, that a specific sum must have been mentioned, and that the fabricator was well aware, "*that some inquisitive researcher like myself,*" would be possessed of documents, which would immediately ascertain the bounty to have been very different from the sum fixed upon. Here we are again nauseated with those eternal references to his documents, with which Mr. Malone has tormented his readers, almost in every page of his work. In answer however to these objections, let me ask, whether it is absolutely inconsistent with the laws of human probability, that a nobleman of distinguished rank, and more distinguished for his patronage of ingenious and deserving men, should bestow on an author, like Shakspeare, a great, and signal munificence? And whether the bard, while all the emotions of gratitude were struggling in his breast, might not express his feelings in the letter, which for the second time I here present to the public, together with the earl's reply.

Coppye



Coppye of mye letter toe hys grace offe Southampton.

Mye Lorde

Doe notte esteeme me a fluggarde nor tardye for thus havyng delayed to answerre or rather toe thank you for youre greate bountye I doe assure you my graciouse and good lorde that thryce I have essayed toe wryte and thryche mye efforts have beene fruitlesse I know notte what toe saye Prose Verse alle all is naughte gratitude is all I have toe utter and that is tooe great and tooe *sublyme a feeling* for poore mortalls toe exprefs O my lord itte is a budde which bllossommes blloms but never dyes itte cherishes sweete nature and lulls the calme Breast to softe softe repose Butte mye goode lorde forgive thys mye departure fromme mye subiecte which was toe retorne thanks and thanks I doe retorne O excuse mee mye lord more at presentte I cannotte

Yours devotedlye and with due respecte  
Wm. Shakspeare

Lord Southampton's answer.

Deare Willam

I cannotte doe lesse than thanke you forre youre kynde letterre butte whye dearest Freynd

N 2

talke

talke so much offe gratitude mye offerre was double the somme butte you woulde accept butte the halfe therefore you neede notte speake soe muche on thatte subiectte as I have beene thye freynde soe I will continue aughte that I can doe forre thee pray commande mee and you shall fynde me

Yours Southampton.

[Supercribed]

“ To the Globe Theatre

“ For Master William

“ Shakspeare.”

To the *orthography*, the objection of Mr. Malone is the same, as that which I considered in the former part of this work. As to the address of “ Your Grace” the reasonings I have urged, on its use in the other letters, will apply with the same force to that, which is now under our consideration.

Instead of “ *Mye Lorde*” with which the letter commences, it should have been Right Honorable I shall not enter at large into this objection, because this gentleman in the subsequent sentence has saved me the trouble of adverting to it, by acknowledging that “ *Right Honorable*” was not the only mode of that time, the other being sometimes used. What credit is due to a writer, who in the  
very

very same sentence hazards the most unqualified assertions, and the completest retractions to annul, and falsify them?

The part of the letter, which next falls under our critic's animadversion, are the following words " *thryce* I have essayed toe write, and *thryce* mye efforts have been fruitlesse." These, he says, are borrowed from Ovid.

" *Ter conata loqui, ter fletibus ora rigavit.*" But in a style of sarcastic contempt, he observes, that he entirely acquits the author of ever having read Ovid, and that he was indebted to Milton's imitation of his favorite poet.

" Thrice he essayed, and thrice, in spight of scorn,  
" Tears such as Angels weep burst forth."

There is perhaps no office in criticism, which is more truly contemptible, than that to which Mr. Malone, and other commentators have aspired; I mean, that of tracing the diction of one author into that of another. They are a sort of Bow-street runners in literature. They are employed in searching for stolen goods, where ever their sagacity, which is not of the highest kind, may direct them. No subject of criticism therefore has been more abused, and none has been undertaken by weaker, or more tasteless illustrators. I do not deny,

deny, that the comparison of parallel beauties, and the display of striking resemblances in different writers may contribute to good taste and to literature ; nor can I deny, that this task has been executed by deep, and accomplished critics. But these great men have often allowed too liberal a scope for their own fancies and caprices on these topics ; so that others, of no critical pretension, and no critical sagacity, have been seduced by their example, and have exerted their unprofitable diligence, in following the suggestions of their own understandings, which no ray of genius, or taste ever condescended to visit.

Hence it is, that these gentlemen have been so often flattered with the notion of having made a wonderful discovery, if they stumble on a single word, or a single phrase, which through the twilight of a confused memory, they think they have seen in other authors. One of Shakspeare's commentators (I forget whether it was Mr. Malone) when the great bard puts into the mouth of one of his characters " Go before I'll follow, finds it out to be an allusion to a passage in Terence" *I præ te sequar*. And Dean Swift somewhere adverts to one of these sagacious critics, who in order to prove that he was indebted for his Tale of the Tub, to a French book entitled *Combat des Livres*, cites the phrases " *If I misremember not,*" and " *I am*  
" *assured,*"



‘ *assured*,’ which he says, he found in the French author. These tasteless commentators are the very plague and bane of literature; and are a sort of poisonous weeds that grow up in the sweetest flowers of Parnassus; as Lucretius expresses it on another occasion,

Est etiam in magnis Heleconis montibus arbor  
Floris odore hominem tetro consueta necare.

But to return to the phrase before us. Is there any reason to suppose, that Milton found the archetype of his own expression in Ovid; or that Shakespeare in this, (or his forger), should have copied from Milton? Is not the repetition of the word “thrice,” a common figure in rhetoric? Did Dryden copy from either of these poets, when he exclaims in his ode to St. Cecilia,

“ And thrice he routed all his foes,  
“ And thrice he slew the slain.”

This is surely a species of criticism, which is founded on principles, so vague, and indefinite, that no rational man would ever propose it, as a test, to which a controversy of the present nature should be brought. It is, however, curious to attend to the personal sarcasms of the critic, when he says that he “ *perfectly acquits the author of*  
“ *having* .

" *having read Ovid.*" Had Mr. Malone been able to read Homer, he would have found this mode of expression was his originally, but of this "*I entirely acquit him.*"

Whether Mr. Malone is intimately acquainted with the supposed forger of these papers or not, the sarcasm is lame and impotent, to whatever quarter it might have been directed. Whether the person, alluded to, has read Ovid or not, if any such person exists, which Mr. Malone has not proved, it would be impossible to ascertain. But for my own part, I should prefer as a critic, and a scholar, the man, who never perused a single line of Ovid, to him, who after all his reading, has neither sensibility to feel, nor capacity to understand that which he has read. I should prefer the man, who neither disfigures, nor defaces the literature, which lies within his reach, to him, whose knowledge is only acquired by rummaging the indexes, settling the punctuations, or exploring the dates of the writings that surround him.

Mr. Malone then finds another passage in this obnoxious letter, viz. when the poet tells his patron that "gratitude is a budde which billossomes, " bilooms, butte never dyes; itte cherishes " sweete nature, ande lulls the calme breaste toe " softe, softe repose." Not to employ ourselves any further with the orthography, on which so much

much has been said already, the good sense of the passage is, I think but slightly affected by the critic's objection. He insinuates that Shakspeare was too good a naturalist not to know, that a bud first blooms, and then blossoms. And so it may be in Ireland, but in England, we are accustomed to say, that a tree first blossoms, but continues in bloom. Admitting the critic to be right, it is justified by the figures, Hyfteron and Proteron.

“ There I was bred and born.”

Then we have a piece of elaborate hyper-criticism, to prove that Dr. Warburton used the words “ lulls our overwearied nature to repose,” in one of his notes on Shakspeare, and that this passage in the letter was plagiarized from it. Here, however, I shall leave Mr. Malone to his own triumph, and shall only observe, that it is a coincidence which might easily be accounted for, by those, who have the slightest observation, or good sense. The same emotions will generally speaking, dictate nearly the same language. Shakspeare in describing the soothing effect of gratitude in the breast that cherishes it, could not find a combination of words more suited to him, than those at which our commentator is disposed to cavil: and Dr. War-

O

burton,

burton, when he sought to convey an idea of that, which frees and disengages the mind from care, would as naturally express himself in the same diction. If Mr. Malone's be sound criticism, the greater part of human composition is a plagiarism, it being impossible to avoid casual coincidences or even striking resemblances, where there exists an uniformity of circumstances, and an identity of feeling in the different writers.

Mr. Malone next observes, that the conclusion of the letter is completely modern; "Oh, excuse me, mye lord, more at presente I cannotte."

"Yours devotedlye and with due respecte"

He objects to "*at presente*" and to "*with due respecte*," which he says are equally modern, as well as objectionable. Mr. Malone on this topic, observes, that there is a fashion, in the style, and conclusion of letters. I agree with him, to the full extent of his observation. But does it follow, that this fashion prescribes precisely the same terms and the same phrases? Certainly not. The forms which at this time, prevail in letter-writing, either in the address, or the conclusion, vary widely from each other. One man, says, "your humble servant: another your devoted and obliged humble servant," through an infinite variety of modifications. Now is it not very unfair reasoning, in referring to the forms of the times, on which we are now occupied,



occupied, to set down any deviation from a specific form, which might have prevailed at that period, as a forged, and unauthentic document? But, says Mr. Malone, the letter will not pass for the composition of our poet, till an example be produced of a person in so low a situation, as that of a *player*, presuming to conclude a letter to a nobleman with the modern familiar assurance of attachment, “ Yours most “ devotedly.” In reply to this, let me ask, whether Shakspeare, at the time, he is supposed to have written this letter, stood in the mere rank and estimation of a “ *poor player* ?” Does not the critic know, that he was a poet, as well as actor; and that in every age, and period, the man of genius, has been exalted almost to an equality with the patrons, that have encouraged and assisted him? I contend therefore, that without any impropriety, and consistently with the relations that subsisted between him, and Southampton, Shakspeare might make use of the form, in which he subscribed his letter to that nobleman.

Now for the answer of the Earl to this epistle. The first verbal objection to the letter is urged against the style of address “ Deare William.” Here as usual, Mr. Malone dictates what was the precise mode of beginning a letter, at the time of which we are speaking. With regard to its being incompatible with the immeasurable distance, at

which Shakspeare stood from Lord Southampton, I affirm again, that there is nothing in the familiarity of address at all irreconcilable to the species of connection, between our bard and his noble patron. The great have in all times lived in habits of familiarity with enlightened and ingenious men, and this is not the only instance, in which this familiarity is observable. But why should I repeat an observation, which I have been compelled so frequently to make, concerning the temerity of laying down any precise or determinate form of expression, as the only mode, which prevailed at a specific period of time. Is it possible for Mr. Malone, or any other antiquary, to have examined a thousandth part of the letters, written at that time? Why therefore, should he draw such particular and minute conclusions, from such general and indefinite premises. Mr. Malone, knows as well as any body, that though there are general characteristical forms of expression, that belong to every age, that there will always be minute exceptions and deviations from habits, however settled, and established. Besides, we are lost in a world of uncertainty on this subject, when we attempt to frame a positive, and dogmatical opinion upon it. And perhaps, so little do we know concerning it, that the very specimens, which Mr. Malone adduces to decide on the prevailing practice of the time  
may

may only be in fact, deviations, and exceptions from the general rule, of which the records and monuments, may have been destroyed by time, and accident.

In page 107, I remarked upon the familiar terms of address used at the period we are now speaking of, and amongst the rest, I instanced "Deareste friende" 1589; "Deareste Py;" and again "My Deere Adiew." In the concluding sentence of the letter, the objector has the threadbare animadversion of its being too familiar, considered as the language of a nobleman to a player. Need I again recall the reader of this work, to the peculiar species of relation which subsisted between these eminent men. Why does Mr. Malone, by applying to Shakspeare the mere character, and designation of the player, overlook altogether his greater distinction of a poet; and not of a poet only, but of one, whom every age does not see, and to whom the world is naturally, and irresistibly disposed to pay a sort of homage, that is allied to idolatry. If, however, after what has been said upon this subject, it is at all necessary, to quote authorities in support of the epistolary usages, which we have been discussing, I will refer to Burleigh's State Papers, where it appears that the mode of ending letters, was capricious, and variable. "Your assured loving friend" in a  
letter.

letter to Sir William Cecil; "Yours always assured, Secretary Petre to Secretary Cecil." Your own assuredly, from the same person, and an infinite number of modifications, all which differ considerably from each other.

Next follows a minute examination, respecting the signature *Southampton*. I will quote the critic's own words. In the reign of Elizabeth," says he, "as your lordship knows, noblemen in their signatures, usually prefixed their christian name to their titles; as their ladies, and my lords, the bishops, do at this day." But it is worth while attending to the reservations in which Mr. Malone whenever he finds his general position untenable, endeavours to shelter himself. He says this was the ordinary practice, though a few peers deviated from that mode, and subscribed their titles only. So completely mistaken, however, in his general proposition is the sagacious commentator, that he will find a double proportion of instances against him, if he had taken the trouble of making researches into the subject. I refer to the Shrewsbury MSS in the College of Arms, where there will be found with innumerable others, the following instances against the remark of Mr. Malone.

Nottingham



Nottingham

Howard

Stafford

Lumley

Pembroke

Cranbourne

Suffolk

Devonshire

Northumberland

Lisle

Salisbury

Fenelon.

If it is necessary to refer to an earlier period, see Burleigh's State Papers, p. 442, &c. &c. where it will be observed, that there are seven examples of the Duke of Norfolk's letters having the signature of Norfolk. In the same work, p. 507, and 520, Lord Boyd, signs only Boyd. In page 537 and 552, there is the simple signature of "Lumley." In 568 Pembroke, and 569 Arundell. I shall bring forward no other documents on a subject, which a very few authorities will illustrate, it would be only an unprofitable but laborious idleness to expatiate. As to the assertion that Lord Southampton uniformly signed H. Southampton, it is observable, that it is supported by no other proof than the two specimens from the Harleian Collection, and no argument therefore can be adduced to prove that he never wrote his name in any other mode. *De apparentibus & non existentibus eadem est ratio.* I observe also, that in the eyes of the most eminent antiquaries, these papers bear little or no resemblance to the hand-writing of the age.

Lec

Let me urge the reader to examine how far my assertion is grounded on fact, by an inspection of the specimens, published by Mr. Malone. The reader who casts his eye over the two specimens of this nobleman's hand-writing in the plate, which this gentleman has published, will observe as wide a dissimilarity in the size and form of the letters, and in the signature especially, as would be observed, in the hand-writing of two distinct individuals. Now where there are two autographs only, and in each of these the signatures differ, how can any man endued with common sense, positively affirm either of them specifically to be the ordinary mode, in which the nobleman alluded to, wrote his name? To sum up his objections to the letter, the critic is pleased to call the whole "false and hollow" a miserable, bungling, nonsensical forgery. Has Mr. Malone, entered into any reasonings upon the internal merits of these letters? If he has not, (as the reader has had ample opportunity of remarking) discussed them, and duly considered their style and beauty, but has picked out the little exceptions against them, on the score of orthography, and epistolary usage, this choice and elegant combination of epithets is contemptible, and ridiculous.

The profession of faith next presents itself, as a subject for Mr. Malone's animadversion. Passing  
over

over the date, and orthography, the first topic, on which our critic enlarges, is grounded on the assumption of its being derived, in the same manner as some other of the documents, from some supposed model or archetype. It was formed, says he, " on a confession of faith written by one John " Shakspeare, which I (Mr. Malone) published " in the end of the year 1790." This paper however from subsequent circumstances turns out not to be genuine ; so that for the second time the gentleman himself acknowledges that his own blunders and confusion respecting a document, he imagined to be authentic, have proved the source of future forgeries of a similar kind. From the confessions, however, which the critic is accustomed to make, from time to time, upon this subject, it should seem, that he has much to answer for, at the public tribunal, for the confident publication of impostures, which at one time, he is pleased to obtrude on the world, and at another shamelessly to retract, and disavow.

But I shall take the liberty of exhibiting to the world, what the sagacious gentleman, styles a mystical rhapsody.

## PROFESSION OF FAITH.

I beyng nowe offe founde Mynde doe hope thatte thys mye wyshe wille atte my deathe bee acceded too as I nowe lyve in Londonne ande as mye soule maye perchance soone quitte thys poore Bodye it is mye desire thatte inne such case I maye bee carryed to mye Native place ande thatte mye Bodye bee there quietly interred wythe as little pompe as canne bee ande I doe nowe inne theese mye seyriouse Moments make thys mye professione of fayth and whiche I doe most solemnye believe I doe fyrste looke toe oune lovyng and greate God ande toe hys gloriouse sonne Jesus I doe also beleyye thatte thys mye weake and frayle Bodye wille retturne toe duste but forre mye soul lette God judge thatte as toe hymselfe shalle seeme meete O omnipotente ande greate God I am fulle offe Synne I doe notte thynke myselfe worthy offe thye grace ande Yette wille I hope forre evene the poore prysonerre whenne bounde with gallyng Irons evenne hee wille hope for Pittye and whenne the teares offe sweet repentance bathe hys wretched pillowe he then looks and hopes forre pardonne  
 -089 thenne



thenne rouze mye Soule and lette hope thatte  
 sweete cherisher offe alle afforde thee comforte alsoe  
 O Manne whatte arte thou whye confidereste thou  
 thyselfe thus grately where are thy great thye boast-  
 ed attrIBUTES buried losse forre everre inne colde  
 Deathe O Manne why attemptest thou toe searche  
 the greatnesse offe the Almightye thou doste butte  
 loose thye labourre more thou attempteste more  
 arte thou losse till thye poore weake thoughtes  
 arre elevated toe theyre summite ande thence as  
 snowe fromme the lessee Tree droppe ande dis-  
 styll themselves till they are noe more O God  
 Manne as I am frayle bye Nature fulle offe Synne  
 yette greate God receyve me toe thye bosomme  
 where alle is sweete contente ande happynesse alle  
 is blysse where discontent isse neverre hearde butte  
 where oune Bonde offe freyndshippe unytes alle  
 Menne Forgive O Lorde alle oure Synnes ande  
 withe thye grete Goodnesse take usse alle to thye  
 Breaeste O cherishe usse like the sweete Chickenne  
 thatte under the Coverte offe herre spreadynge wings  
 Receyves herre lyttle Broode and hoeverynge  
 oerre themme keepes themme harmlesse ande in  
 saferye.

W<sup>m</sup>. SHAKSPEARE,

With respect to the incidental observation of the orthography, and phraseology, to which he brings the same thread-bare and senseless exceptions, I refer to what I have so amply observed in a former part of this work. But the internal characteristics of it, the simple effusions of a sincere piety which it breathes, and the solemn and dignified diction it every where displays, are not, I trust, affected by the tasteless abuse of such a critic as Mr. Malone. There are however some minute particularities of phraseology, on which as he has bestowed a considerable portion of observation, it behoves me by no means to disregard.

The first passage selected for remark, is the allusion to the *Chicken*, that spreads her wings for the protection of her brood. That it should have been suggested by the passage in the New Testament, will not operate as a deduction from its beauty as a composition, or from the proof in favor of its authenticity. As to the inapplicability of the word "*chicken*," on which some stress is laid, I shall not detain my readers with minute, and frivolous remarks on the distinction between a hen, and a chicken. Without, however, taking up the subject as a matter of Natural History, it must be obvious to all, that the word *Chicken* is a general term for the male and female species of this fowl; and in this sense, none but the most deter-

determined, and incorrigible caviller can find any fault with the correctness of the expression. Before however I quit this part of our subject, I would protest against a proposition, laid down by Mr. Malone, with his characteristic confidence, that these apparent departures from verisimilitude, on which he has alluded are obvious artifices, to give an air of authenticity to the whole, on the principle that a forger would have carefully avoided them. Now, I would ask, whether this mode of procedure has been followed by forgers in general? Have they not, in all the instances, we have at present on record, diligently endeavoured, to throw the veil of truth, and probability over their productions. Mr. Malone might with equal reason, contend that he who forged a bank-note, and avoided all resemblance or analogy to his archetype would be as ingenious and successful as if he had imitated the aspect and characteristics of that, which he wished to represent.

We now come to another verbal topic, I mean, the exception to the use of the word *accede*, as not being the phrase of the age, in which Shakespeare flourished. Here is an opportunity of triumph to the critic. A word, which bears not a general and acknowledged acceptation in the time, to which it is ascribed, he immediately seizes as his natural prey. At what period, the word *ac-*  
*cede*

*cede* in its present interpretation, first glided into use, it is impossible to ascertain, nor has the objector himself attempted to prove. I will not turn to the lexicons, and glossaries of the age. These are not authorities, for the use of words, which are always implicitly to be followed. Most unquestionably in those days, as in the present, terms were used, which the compilers of dictionaries either overlooked or refused to recognize. How many words at this time may be found in the correctest writers, which it would be in vain to hunt for in any dictionary, or glossary existing, words however, which though they are destitute of authority or precedent, are still justified by the analogy, and principles of the language. Besides who has coined new words with greater licence than Shakespeare? But I will not rest on the probability, that the verb *accede* was in use at this time; because the secondary and derivative word (*access*) had obtained the same construction. I will do more, I will shew from the authority of Florio's, dictionary published in 1611, that the word "*accedere*;" to *accede*, to *assent unto*, was known, and constantly in use at that time. Another proof of the ignorance of the commentator, as to the use of words in the time of Shakespeare. I cannot take my leave of this topic, without beseeching the reader, to compare the

Profession



Profession of Faith, which I have published, with that edited by Mr. Malone in the year 1790. The ridiculous cant, and jargon with which this detected imposture overflows, forms the most striking contrast to the sublime and pious simplicity, which constitutes the prominent merit of the former composition. In his critical animadversions on the beauty of its style, I am willing to be at issue with such a writer as this gentleman; when I may shelter myself under the respectable authority (with many others) of the venerable Dr. Jo. Warton, who on perusing it, observed with much energy, “ *that though there were many beauties in the liturgy of our church, yet this composition far surpassed them all!*”

The next piece, on which Mr. Malone employs his critical powers, is the letter from Shakspeare to Richard Cowley, a *low actor*, as he is called, that played the part of Verges in *Much Ado About Nothing*? That a person, who performed the character was necessarily a low actor, is a very unfair insinuation. Would any man be bold enough to call Mr. Garrick a *low actor*, because he played Scrub, or Abel Drugger? And where is the history of Cowley to be found to justify Mr. Malone in his assertion that Cowley was a *low actor*, except from the supposition of his playing in *Much Ado About Nothing*? His theatrical powers might indeed be limited, but it is very probable

probable, that he might have held in private life, that fair and honorable estimation, that might have entitled him to the honour of our poet's friendship. What the critic, however objects to more particularly in this paper, are the two words "*witty*" "*and whimsicall*" in the following passage. Ha-  
 " vinge alwaye accountedde thee a pleasaunte and  
 " *witty* personne and oune whose companye I doe  
 " much esteeme, I have sent thee inclosedde a  
 " *whimsicall* conceyte."

To the word "*witty*" it is objected, that in our author's time, it was used exclusively in the sense of cunning, shrewdness, and applied to the intellectual powers in general. In answer to this, I refer the commentator of Shakspeare, to Shakspeare himself.

Val. " Sir Thurio borrows his wit from your  
 " ladyship's looks, and spends what he  
 " borrows kindly in your company.

Two Gent. of Verona.

Act. 2, S. 4.

" That I had my good wit out of the  
 " Hundred merry tales."

Much Ado About Nothing.

Act. 2, S. 1.

In

In the fifth act of the same play Claudio says to Benedict, " we are high proof melancholy, and " would fain have it beaten away. Wilt thou use " thy *wit* ?

What does this mean, but a request, that Benedict would exert his powers of humour to dispel the melancholy, of which he complained ?

Again, in *As You Like It*, Act 5. Sc. 1.

*William*. " Ay, Sir, I have a pretty *wit*."

And in *Second Part of Henry V.* Sc. 4, Falstaff says

" I am not only *witty* in myself, but the cause that " *wit* is in other men."

These quotations are sufficient to shew, that the word was used at that time, in the peculiar sense, which Mr. Malone's objection denies it, as well as in the more general and enlarged interpretation.

Upon the word "*whymfscalle*" we have references to the dictionaries of Cotgrave, Cole, and the other lexicographers of the critic. I shall speak very little on this head. Dictionaries never admit words, which have not been in received and established use. Now, I do not contend that the objected word had arrived at this general acceptance, before the time of Shakspeare, or had obtained such a general currency, as to introduce it into the compilations of Mr. Malone's literary

Q

favorites,

favorites, Cole and Cotgrave. But every word must have had its birth, and first introduction into the language. Dr. Johnson traced this word no higher than Addison. Addison would probably, have referred him to some source, whence he derived it, and that source would probably have led to another. So that if it is impossible to point out the precise period, of its primary introduction, the presumptive argument is as much in my favor, as in that of Mr. Malone; as it is equally as fair to ascribe the first use of it to Shakspeare, as to any other writer.

But it was an innovation by no means inconsistent with the principles of our language. All derivative languages like the English, are in a state of perpetual progression. Hence new words, at the mere discretion of a popular writer have been derived from the latin. Substantives and verbs require their several adjectives; and every one, in the unsettled periods of our diction, thought himself endued with a licence to derive adjectives from nouns, in general use, controlled by no other rule, than the common analogies of the tongue. The word *whim*, a contraction probably of *whim-wham*, was used at that time in the sense applied to *whimsical*. It has been before observed, that Shakspeare availed himself of the privilege of coining new words; and when so convenient a phrase,



phrase, as the adjective of *whim*, held out a temptation, it is natural to suppose, that he did not resist it. We have indeed an instance in which Shakspeare has used the word *whimpled*, when speaking of Cupid.

“ *This whimpled, whining, purblind, wayward boy.*”

Dr. Johnson supposes it to come from *whimper*, which has the same meaning, as *whine*. Now besides the absurdity of charging this beautiful passage with so gross a tautology, it is contrary to the principles of our language, to suppose that *whimper* in its participle will be *whimpled*. It is not natural to suppose that it is compounded of “ *whim-led*,” which signifies “ humorous, fantastical” &c ? So that, if this conjecture be probable, there can remain scarcely a doubt concerning the general acceptation of the word, and it is no violent conjecture to suppose, that Shakspeare might have given a common word the usual termination of an adjective. I have now trespassed considerably on the patience of the reader, in following Mr. Malone through the greater part of the intricate labyrinth of verbal objections, in which he has involved the subject. But much remains to be said upon the other documents, against which our critic is pleased to take exceptions. What next presents itself to our consideration, is the

DEED of GIFT  
TO WILLIAM HENRY IRELAND.

Mr. Malone observes sarcastically, that this is the first deed he ever perused, where a story was so regularly and circumstantially told. Now it is worthy of remark, that the critic has presented the deed in so defective and mutilated a form, that it is impossible to pronounce with precision concerning it, from his statement of it. The beginning of the deed runs thus. " I William  
" Shakspeare of Statford on Avon but now livyng  
" in London neare unntoe a yard calledd or knowne  
" bye the name of Irelands yarde in the Black-  
" fryars London nowe beyinge att thys preasaunte  
" tyme of sound mynde" &c. &c. " I didde  
" with my own hande fyrste wryte on Papere the  
" contents hereof butte for the moure securytye  
" ande thatte noe dispute whatever myghte hap-  
" penne after my death," &c. Here then is an answer to every objection, that may be grounded on the informality of the deed, namely, the confession made by Shakspeare himself of his having written it in the manner, which his own mind suggested to him.

But the first objection is an anachronism, which it seems, Mr. Malone has found in the Instrument.

Shakspeare

Shakspeare in this deed, it is said, describes himself as living at Blackfryars in October, 1604. But it is manifest, says Mr. Malone, that the King's servants were not then possessed of the Blackfryars. What does this prove, allowing the objection in point of fact to be valid? Why it does not falsify a syllable of what appears on the face of the deed. If the Theatre was not at Blackfryars, might not the poet have resided in that part of the metropolis? Nothing that contradicts such a supposition, can be found in the history of his life.

Let us attend to the remark upon the circumstance recorded in the deed, of the accident on the Thames. Whether Shakspeare could swim, says the sagacious gentleman, I have no means of ascertaining. Now it is rather surprizing, that he who could take the gage, and dimensions of Elizabeth's hand-writing, and could ascertain with such accuracy the progressive sizes, to which it expanded as she advanced in life, should not be able to inform the world, whether Shakspeare was an adept in swimming, and point out the place, where he swam, and the distance to which his art would enable him to swim. I think it however extremely probable, says the critic from the admirable lines in the *Tempest*, that he was well acquainted with that useful art. Can any remark be more truly absurd?

absurd? Does it necessarily follow, that Shakspeare was versed in the mysteries of every art, occupation, or mystery to which he has alluded in his writings? It is a fact that the poet Thomson was perfectly unacquainted with the science of swimming, which he has described with such glowing eloquence, and with such minute accuracy. It is then insinuated, as an incongruous and contradictory circumstance, that none of his friends, nor the boatmen, but only W. H. Ireland should have attempted his rescue. Does Mr. Malone suppose that every boatman, who navigates a small boat on the Thames is versed in the art of swimming? I am afraid were Mr. M. himself to depend on such assistance, were a similar accident to befall him, that his specific gravity would very soon reach the bottom of the river, especially if he had a bundle of his notes on Shakspeare in his pocket. But as to the affected banter of stripping off his jerkyn, &c. Let me ask whether any one, who had the smallest degree of firmness, at such a moment, or the slightest regard for the life of another, would make an attempt of this nature without throwing off the incumbrances of dress as quickly as he could, which at that time were very heavy, and would necessarily have obstructed the the action of his limbs on such an occasion?

As to the word *upset*, which Mr. Malone censures,



tures, as a word of modern growth, the only grounds on which it is objected to are, that it is not to be found in Johnson's Dictionary, and that he (Mr. M.) has not met with it. To these objections I answer that Dr. Johnson, it is well known, has omitted several hundred words in general acceptance. Mr. Herbert Croft goes so far as to say thousands. As to the objection, I should be ashamed seriously to refute the absurd position that the critic lays down, *that no word can be genuine, with which he himself is unacquainted.*

Passing over the useless disquisition, which Mr. Malone has protruded into his work, concerning the William Henry Ireland mentioned in the deed, we are once more arrived at verbal discussions. In a conveyance to Shakspeare (now in the possession of Mr. Wallis) the tenement which he purchased, says the critic, is described, as having been " sometimes in the tenure of James Gardyner, Esquire, " and since that in the tenure or occupation of one " William Ireland, or of his assignees or assigns." Now mark the ingenuous inference of the critic. " From the prefix *one*, the want of the addition " of *Gent.* and the word *occupation*, which at " that time was a word, that denoted trade, I had " no doubt that he was a tradesman." A piece of more contemptible criticism, than the acceptance, which is applied to the word *occupation* by  
Mr.

Mr. Malone, never disgraced the pages of any man, who pretended to criticism, or literature. The word *occupation* did at the period to which I am alluding, as well as at the present time, mean nothing more, than that the house was occupied by the person alluded to. As to the insertion of the double name of *William Henry* Ireland, on which the presumption of fraud is grounded by Mr. Malone, I would observe, that if, as Mr. Malone supposes, the forger had copied the authentic deed in which there was only a single christian name, he must have been extremely inexperienced, and blindly stupid in the fabrication, had he not made his copy with a stricter accuracy.

Then we are informed, that in the last century and long after it, persons of the first rank in England contented themselves with one christian name. It seems that our laborious investigator has looked into lists of the House of Commons, into the catalogue of Baronets created by King James, among the Knights of the Bath, nay that he has pried into several parliaments, and that no such distinction as a two-fold christian name is to be found. What is to be said to all this? my only reply, shall be the citation of authorities.

“ Richard Maria Dumville, Esq. born anno 1603.”

“ Huntingdon Hastings Corney, Esq. anno 1603.”

“ Anna

Anna Maria Estoufsteville, ditto."

" Thomas Maria Wingfield, ap. temp. Edward 6th."

The above names were communicated to me by favor of Francis Townsend, Esq. Windsor Herald.

In a " true report of a late Practise, &c." by Barnabie Riche, 1582, in quarto, black letter, the name of Captain Thomas Maria Wingfield will be found, and is most probably the person, before mentioned. In the Sheldon Pedigree will be observed Henrietta Maria, daughter of Thomas Savage, Vis. Rock Savage, born 1618. In the will of Sir John White, of Tucksford, in the reign of James the 1st, the following name appears as a Witness. " Welbecke Marke Browneley." In *Lyson's Environs of London*, vol. 3, p. 71, it is observed, that the following baptismal entry is in the Hornsey Register. " Lucius F. Thomæ " Gulielmi ex Louisa Mariâ, bap. 4. May 1637." Now if Louisa Maria had a son in May 1637, it is most probable that she was christened about the period of the Dramatic Poet. I am also furnished by Mr. Beltz of the Heralds College, with the christian name of Mark Antony, tho' the surname cannot be found. If there is need of further reference, I will cite the name of Henry Frederic,

R

son

son of James the First. Nay I will refer to a still earlier date. In *Lyson's Environs*, vol. 3, p. 11, we shall find as far back as the year 1416, an inscription in Hendon Church, to the memory of "John Atte Hevyn."

Surely these citations will be sufficient for my purpose. In fact, the use of the two-fold christian names, so positively and dogmatically objected to by Mr. Malone, must have been a matter of such undeniable notoriety, that I know not which is the most astonishing, the unaccountable stupidity of the person who overlooked these evidences, or his unparalleled effrontery in making such an assertion.

When Mr. Malone observes in this exceptionable deed of gift, that the written Plays of Henry IV. Henry V. King John, King Lear, &c. are named in the conveyance, he triumphantly exclaims, with his usual arrogance and inaccuracy, that the Lear was not written till after October 24, 1604. The extreme ignorance, displayed in this position, is almost intolerable. He persists in saying that the Play was written after James was proclaimed king, *and that was not on the 24th of March 1602-3, but on the 24th of October 1604. So much for accuracy of dates!* In reply to this, I quote Camden's Elizabeth, Book 4, p. 661. which will clearly prove the ignorance of the critic on this subject.

" On



“ On the 24th of March, 1602-3, being  
 “ the Eve of the Annunciation of the Blessed  
 “ Virgin, she (Queen Elizabeth) was called out  
 “ of the prison of her earthly body, &c. &c.  
 “ The sad misfortune which she left of herself to the  
 “ English, was much lessened by the great hope  
 “ conceived of the virtues of King James her  
 “ successor, who A FEW HOURS AFTER *was pro-*  
 “ *claimed King*, with the joyfull shouts and ac-  
 “ clamations of all the people.”

“ ‘The King’ (James of Scotland) “ being  
 “ arrived to the 36th year of his reign, continued  
 “ a good correspondence with Queen Elizabeth,  
 “ as the only way to secure his succession, she  
 “ having a little before her death, (which hap-  
 “ pened on the 24th of March 1602) declared  
 “ him her successor. Whereupon he was THE SAME  
 “ DAY at Whitehall *proclaimed King of England,*  
 “ Scotland, France and Ireland, with great Ac-  
 “ clamations.”

Sandford's History of England,  
 Book VII. Chap. I. p. 554.

As to the fatal objection of the indorsement  
 of the words 2 James, which it should seem is  
 a decisive proof of the forgery, let me remind the  
 reader, that it is by no means improbable, that

the deeds were indorsed, a very long period after they were executed, and upon the best authority I learn that deeds of that period were seldom indorsed at the time they were drawn. I have shewn the deed to many antiquaries, and to persons of the law, versed in the learning of these Papers, who have confirmed this remark. These are all the observations, which I shall make upon the deed, which Mr. Malone has selected as the peculiar victim to his exceptions. What I have said, will I trust, be found to comprize all that it behoves me to say upon the subject. I do not take the defence of the Instrument upon me any further, than by proving the allegations of Mr. Malone to be fallacious, and unfounded. And it is a rule in logic, that when the negative is disproved, the contrary proposition is established.

Now for the *Tributary Lines to Ireland*.

“ Oh model of Virtue Charity’s sweetest  
 “ Child, thy Shakspeare thanks thee  
 “ Nor Verse, nor Tear can  
 “ paint my Soul nor say by  
 “ half how much I love thee.”

“ I beg pardon,” exclaims Mr. Malone, (who among other caprices, has affected a style of gallantry) “ of all the young ladies of Great Britain  
 “ and

“ and Ireland; there is not one of them, fifteen  
 “ years old, who would not produce a better ef-  
 “ fusion after reading the first novel, that fell into  
 “ their hands.” I solemnly wish, that this gen-  
 tleman, may never have stronger reasons to beg  
 pardon, and deprecate the anger of the sex, than  
 the supposition, for which he apologizes.

But the next objectionable article, is the view  
 of Wm. Henry Ireland’s house, and coat of arms,  
 &c. It is objectionable on account merely on the  
 word *View*, being wholly unknown, as he says at  
 the time, in the sense of a delineature of a house,  
 &c. on canvas, paper, or copper. Then as usual,  
 he tells us where he has searched; and the autho-  
 rities of lexicographers, and vocabularies, into  
 which he has examined: though all this does no-  
 thing at all, but exhibit an illustration of the in-  
 stinct, with which this gentleman is endowed, of  
 never looking into the proper places.

In Florio’s Italian Dictionary printed 1611,  
*veduta* or *vista* has the English sense annexed “ any  
 “ sight, view, or prospect,” with other synonymes  
 of the same tendency. It is acknowledged by Mr.  
 Malone, that in this sense the word was used in  
 French so early as the sixteenth century; and it is  
 not therefore, an assumption to suppose that it should  
 have crept into our idiom, much earlier, than the  
 period, to which Mr. Malone attributes it. I say  
 nothing

nothing about the allusion to the source from which this Haberdasher, as he is contemptuously termed, derived his armorial bearings. We all know, that some of the most antient families in this country sprung originally from the commercial departments of life ; and perhaps were we to examine the original fountain, whence Mr. Malone derived the arms of his own family we should not find them more honorably or unequivocally obtained.

We will now say a few words on the two coloured drawings, representing the characters of Bassanio, and Shylock : and here, for the first time, we are surprized with a modest confession on the part of the objector, that he had never seen, what he objects to, and that if he had seen them, he was not entitled by any knowledge of the art to decide upon them. In opposition to his assertion, that he “ has received information from unquestionable judges, that they are drawings of “ a recent date,” I would observe, that waving my own pretensions to an accurate knowledge of these matters, I appealed to the judgement of Artists, whom I looked upon as the most competent to pronounce on the subject. The uniform opinion of these persons was, that they were the genuine productions of the times, to which they are imputed. In the course of several months, during which the drawings remained in my possession,



session, I discovered an illegible hand-writing, but I was never able to decypher it. On shewing it however to Mr. Hewlet of the Temple, whom I have mentioned in my preface, that gentleman with the assistance of glasses, discovered the name of Johannes Hoskins, a person who at a later period we are told by the late Lord Orford and other writers, became an artist of great merit.

### AGREEMENT

Between SHAKSPEARE and LOWINE.

On this head, it appears, that the papers of a Mr. Henflowe, laid before the public in Mr. Malone's last edition 1793 of Shakspeare, are appealed to, in opposition to the validity of the agreement now under consideration. Now, upon the hypothesis of the forgery of the papers, does it not appear very singular, even to the Critic himself, that the fabricator should not have resorted to these valuable treasures of Mr. Henflowe, especially as the greater part of them had been circulated in a book, which might be found in every book-stall through the country?

However the principal objection is, that John Lowin tho' he says " his name was sometimes written Lewin, never is to be found *Lowine*." Is it not strange, that Mr. Malone, the commentator on Shakspeare should so heedlessly convict himself of  
never

never having looked into the first folio Edition of the Great Bard, published 1623. Let me then inform him, that in the list of the actors, he would have found this man's name spelt in the objectionable manner. "John Lowine." This is surely a bad specimen of Mr. Malone's accuracy. In his classical way we may say, *ab uno crimine disce OMNES*. When Mr. Malone again quotes a learned language, I would exhort him to be aware of the *distinctions of genders*, though it is a species of learning, in which I am informed, he is not minutely versed. For *omnes* read *omnia*, as I have before remarked.

The word *Composition* is objected to, as to the acceptation that it bears in the agreement, I shall refer to no other authorities to justify the sense, but that which Mr. Malone himself has cited in a note. "Simple is the device, and the *composition* "meane." Epist. Ded. to Mother Hulbard's Tale, 1590. No one who reads this passage, can question the inapplicability of the quotation.

## AGREEMENT

BETWEEN SHAKSPEARE AND CONDELL.

The first topic that occurs on this head in the shape of an objection, is the thread-bare observation on the denotation of a guinea "as oune pounde  
" and

“ and oune shillynge per week.” I shall not reiterate the reasonings, on which I have entered in a former part of the work, but I shall gladly leave Mr. Malone to the enjoyment of the fullest triumph that his vanity can derive from so trivial and senseless a cavil.

It seems very surprizing to Mr. Malone, that the salary which Lowine received at the theatre, should have exceeded that of Condell, who stood so high in the estimation of Shakspeare and whose name stands as a patentee immediately after that of Heminges. Whatever might be the rank which Condell held in the friendship of the bard, his merits as an actor might have been very insignificant. It is reasonable to presume that the players were rewarded according to their professional talents at that time, as at present. Shakspeare himself we are taught to believe was by no means a good actor ; and his name might still stand first as a principal patentee in the Theatre.

Then we are reminded that from the terms of the agreement by which he covenants “ for three  
 “ years to play upon the stage, for the said Wm  
 “ Shakspeare alle Comedyes ande Tragedyes  
 “ which he the said Wm Shakspeare may at any  
 “ *tyme during the said terme cause to be played not*  
 “ *written or composed by himselfe butte are the wri-*  
 “ *tings or composytyons of others ;* from which we must  
 S suppose

suppose that he would never suffer one of his own  
 “ pieces to be performed in his own playhouse, or  
 “ that he bore such enmity to Condell, that he had  
 “ made a fixed resolution that he this actor should  
 “ not discharge any part in them.” This is the conclusion into which our critic wishes to precipitate his readers. But is it an improbable supposition that the covenant was a separate agreement, for the express performance of the plays that were not written by himself, and that those of his own composition therefore, had been the subjects of a distinct and specific agreement. We are then favoured with another conclusion of the ingenious gentleman, conceived in the true style and genius of his profound criticisms. This remark only amounts to this, that he infers the deed of Condell to be spurious, and that Condell could not have used the peculiar sort of autograph in the MS because he himself in the course of his favorite researches into Parish Vestries and *Charnel Houses*, has not stumbled upon that actor’s autograph.

As to the indorsement of the deed (not to observe that the indorsement might have been probably made many years after the deed) to the English form of which Mr. Malone objects, I shall refer the reader to several authentic deeds now in the possession of a gentleman, to whom I have the liberty of referring, should any particular  
 enquiry



enquiry be made on this head. Amongst these is an *English Indorsement* in the following deed, viz. A Deed of Gift made in the 22d year of the reign of Henry VI. by John Cannye-forde to John Wolfe of landed property at Trowbridge Wilts. The Deed is in Latin, and Cannye-forde is there described *Clericus* ; and the indorsement is as follows. " John " Cannye-forde *Clark*." There is also another deed of gift dated 28th Edward III. in Latin from Wm. Heye to Philipppo le Schephurde, and it is indorsed in English thus " 28th Edward third, Phl. le " Schephurd." Among innumerable other deeds with the citation of which I shall not overwhelm the faculties of the reader, I have selected these, which I trust will shew very fully that there are existing indorsements in English to deeds of the period, on which we are now occupied.

The Lease to Michael Frazer next comes under animadversion. Upon this head I shall not detain the reader very long. But I might advert with justifiable severity to the sarcastic allusion made by the critic to the persons who subscribed to the work. Their rank in life and the literary reputation of the greater part, whose names adorn the catalogue, are far above the reach of any ridicule that Mr. Malone can direct against them. But the critic's principal objection is this ; *that the Globe on the Southwark side of the Thames*, is de-

S 2
scribed

scribed to be by *Black Friars, London*. Upon this subject I shall say but little; not feeling it my duty to discourse at large upon all the wire-spun and trivial cavils that a critic like Mr. Malone is able to bring forward. I produced the deed in the presence of many intelligent persons, who were of opinion that the word (*by*) should be construed with a greater latitude of meaning, than Mr. Malone seems to allow it; and that it signifies general vicinity, rather than a strict proximity. And here I will make one general observation, which the candid reader will apply to other parts of the MS. I would remark that amongst a multifarious mass of papers, like those in my possession, it would be absurd to suppose that some would not furnish matter of petty quibble, and exception to those minds, which are not sufficiently comprehensive to embrace general arguments, or pursue general reasonings upon these subjects.

And now we are approaching that, which Mr. Malone styles to be worse than the "thickest Cimmerian darkness," the deed of trust to John Hemynge. They who are conversant with the critic's powers of illustrating and penetrating obscurities, will be rather surprized that he should have any objection to that, with which he is so very familiar. Every animal is endued with natural

tural organs adapted to the element in which it lives ; and I have always thought, that black letter criticks and commentators who seem to breathe only in darkness, never enjoyed repose 'till they had brought their author's sense and meaning to the mist and obscurity of their own understandings and apprehensions.

But let us endeavour to state concisely one or two of Mr. Malone's objections. The first is, that the deed sets out with informing us, that at the time at which the deed is dated, Shakspeare had not yet returned into the country. The deed of mortgage in the next year (March 10th and 11th, 1612-13) is adduced by Mr. Malone to invalidate the position. On this head I have only to remark that the objection is not supported by the mortgage deed ; because the intervening year would have afforded Shakspeare ample time for the retirement to which the critic refers.

Then it is animadverted on, as improbable, that the deed should have opened in these words, " having found much wickedness amongst those  
" of the lawe, &c." very unlikely says Mr. Malone, that he should have had so low an opinion of lawyers, when he was in habits of friendship with several members of that profession. What incongruity and what inconsistency is there in this? Why does Mr. Malone infer, that because our  
bard

bard had a few connexions in that profession, for whom he had the highest esteem and respect, he could not have entertained a general impression against the character of the body in general? The objector ought to have known also, that there are a variety of passages in the works of Shakspeare, in which he has put into the mouths of his personages many very severe and striking animadversions on the body, against which Mr. Malone thinks it impossible, that he could have imbibed any dislike or prepossession.

These are specimens of his reasonings upon the deed of trust to Heminges, with which I suppose the reader will be perfectly satisfied. He has indeed favoured us with many other observations, drawn from the armoury of antiquarian and legal researches, with which I shall not condescend to interfere. My purpose was not that of pursuing Mr. Malone through all the dark avenues and subteraneous apartments of the gothick edifice of reasoning, which he has erected with such infinite labour and diligence.

Mr. Malone, p. 300, with respect to the child mentioned in the deed, to whose use the eight plays are appropriated, says that he “ presumes the  
 “ child to be Shakspeare’s god-son young William  
 “ D’Avenant; and “ I fear,” says he, “ that I am  
 “ answerable for his having been brought for-  
 “ ward.”



“ward.” So that the critic acknowledges himself guilty of what has not been laid to his charge, viz. of having brought a bantling into the world. I sincerely hope that Mr. Malone will have the grace to erase the confession of the illicit and wanton ways of which he pleads guilty, in his future editions of Shakspeare.

But because I have not entered into all the abstruse arguments, in which he has bewildered himself and his readers, it would be an unfair inference to draw, that I have not succeeded in the object of this work, which was that of exposing the greater part of the fallacies, errors, sophisms, and impertinent cavils with which he has attempted to impose on the world, in the shape of critical investigations. Let the topics I have selected, serve as a general specimen of the style of his writing and the force of his arguments. Let the public judge by the articles I have examined, of the rest of those broken wares and mouldy commodities, he has exposed to sale.

I have now finished my observations on that part of Mr. Malone’s work, which respects the deeds and documents. I shall now only trespass on the patience of the reader, with a few remarks on the *Lear* and the *Hamlet*.

Here the Critic sets out with an ingenuous avowal of his being utterly disqualified for the discussion

cussion of the subject. He observes that he has not collated a single line of the *Lear*, except one speech; and that life would be too short for the examination of such trash, when a single glance is sufficient to shew it to be a plain and palpable forgery. Yet it might be imagined, that he whose whole life has been spent in the task, to the drudgery of which he now takes such an extraordinary aversion, would not have felt much repugnance to the minute and slender inquiries of collating, and exploring the passages on which he notwithstanding presumes to give a decisive, and oracular opinion. "Three words" says he, "will suffice on the subject." Yet these three words, multiplying themselves like the polypi, are made to fill nearly twenty pages of his volume.

As to the single passage he has selected, I shall say a few words.

*Alb.* "Whats the matterre Sir."

*Lear.* "Marke mee Ile tell the life and death I amme  
 "ashamed thou hast powerre to shake mye manhood  
 "thusse, that these hotte teares that breake fromme mee  
 "perforce should make worse blasts and foggs  
 "onne the unnetennedere woundinges of a fatherres curse  
 "Eysse playe thys part agayne Ile plucke ye oute and caste  
 "you with the waterres that you maye temperre claye."

Allowing Mr. Malone the incorrectness of the speech as it stood, I by no means admit it to be  
 a fair

a fair standard by which the rest is to be estimated.

In the sixth line, after the word *fathers*, *curse* is unquestionably omitted, and in the next line *usse* is an error instead of *Eyffe*, as it stands in the MS. These are errors of transcription for which I am alone accountable, but if the reader with these corrections will peruse the passage, I am persuaded that it will appear in a light totally different, if not a real emendation of the vulgar text.

But let me beseech the reader to attend to the following lines in the MS (the speech of Kent in the last scene), which Mr. Malone observes that any school boy might have written.

*Kente.* " Thanks Sir butte I goe toe thatte unknowne lande.

" Thatte chaynes each Pilgrim faste within its soyle  
 " Bye livynge menne moste shunn'd mouste dreadedde  
 " Stille mye goode masterre this same journey tooke  
 " He calls me I amme contente and strayght obeye  
 " Thenne farewelle worlde the busye sceane is done  
 " Kente liv'd mouste true Kente dyes mouste lyke a  
 " manne."

I make no comment upon these lines, though I cannot abstain from remarking, that he who compares this emendation with the following speech of Kent, as it exists in the other editions,

T

" I haue

“ I have a journey, Sir, shortly to go ;

“ My master calls me, I must not say, no.”

and does not pronounce it to be replete with pathos and energy, must resign all pretensions to critical discernment as well as poetical taste. The above passage has received the commendations of all who have read it ; and it is much more easy, after the specimen he has given us of his taste and erudition, to suppose that Mr. Malone is not endued with the slightest particle of either, than that the best scholars of the age should have given their suffrage in favor of lines, which any school boy might have written.

We are next told, as an objection to the papers, that the method of numbering the lines, is unauthorized by the usage of Shakspeare and the time in which he wrote. Here we have once more an unauthorized assertion. Is Mr. Malone to impose the tenet of the Pythagorean School on his disciples ? Is every position, which falls from his pen, to be received with implicit reverence, on matters of controversy like the present ? Has this gentleman in his possession any of the original MSS of Shakspeare, to shew the specific usage of the bard in this respect ? If he has not, upon what ground does his inference rest ? The same observation will apply to the circumstance of the  
plays.



plays, having been written on one side only of the paper. It may be further remarked, that at that time, these usages must have been variable, and uncertain, and I would observe that as far as the latter objection goes it is invalid, because many of the MSS. in my possession contain the writing on both sides, which Mr. Malone positively asserts, the quality of the paper would not admit of.

At the close of these remarks, we are presented with an argument, which it would surely perplex our modern logicians, and those who are versed in the prevailing forms of reasoning, to analyze, and examine. "The outworks being demolished the fort must surrender," in plain English, having laid down in a mass of accumulated assertion, that the other writings, whether love letters, addresses to his patron, or copies of verses, are a collection of unintelligible nonsense, the Play of Vortigern, which he had not read, nor seen, nor examined, must be unintelligible nonsense likewise. This is the new fashioned syllogism, with which the garrulous commentator has finished his observations on the subject of the amended plays, lately presented to the world. I have adverted to it, that the reader may see the uniform tenor of the learned gentleman's reasoning, and observe the admirable correspondence and unity of structure and design, that prevails through the whole

of his inquiry from the first to the last page of his book.

As to the whole length portrait of Shakspeare in oil, and the uncut two first folios, sarcastically alluded to by Mr. Malone, I have nothing to remark farther, than that the communication was made to me by my son, and that all the information I ever received concerning them, rests on his authority. As a proof of Mr. Malone's accuracy with respect to the facts advanced in his book, he talks (in a note), of a letter in which Shakspeare speaks highly of *Vortigern* and insists on a larger price for the copyright of it than his bookseller was willing to give him. On this I have to remark, that the letter alluded to, does not specify *Vortigern*, nor does it bear any appearance of its alluding to that play at all. This will serve for as good a specimen of the critic's faculty of dreaming, as that with which he has favoured us at the conclusion of his volume.

To shew the facility, with which an imposture of this kind might be conducted, the critic cites an instance of his own patience and labor, in the execution of a task which he prescribed to himself, of copying out the whole poem of *Romeus and Juliet*, in three days. This however proves only what the laborious texture of Mr. Malone's mind is capable of sustaining. It is a capacity which I do not mean to deny him in common,  
with

with every stationer's apprentice and clerk in the kingdom. With the same pains and diligence he might have copied the Iliad, without being able to interpret a single character of the Greek language, or Euclid's works, without knowing a single proposition in mathematics. But does this instance of persevering dulness apply to the mass of papers before us; in which not only manual industry, but manual dexterity, and identity of fiction, and no ordinary powers of mind are uniformly displayed, upon the hypothesis of its being an imposture?

But this collection of remarks, egotisms, and conjectures at length seems to approach its termination. Mr. Malone has displayed all the varieties of the human faculty in the course of his enquiry: he has been the critic, the wit, the antiquary, the scholar, the man of gallantry. But what ought to exhibit the singular dexterity of Mr. Malone in acting the several parts he has assumed, is the circumstance that nature has denied him all the qualities requisite for the task; just as it would be a surprising feat of dexterity, if a man were to dance the rope without legs; for he is at once a critic without taste, a poet without imagination, a scholar without learning, a wit without humour, an antiquary without the least knowledge of antiquity, and *a man of gallantry, without*——

But



But the art in which he possesses a truly admirable faculty, is that of *Dreaming*. Over dreams he possesses an unlimited dominion; and he seems like the God of Dreams in Virgil, surrounded with all the drowsy powers and agents, which thronged in the eternal abode of silence and sleep.

After having tried the powers of his art in lulling his readers to sleep, through the course of several hundred pages, he concludes with a long account of his own dream, which for the amusement of my readers, I shall attempt to analyze and examine.

In a collection of marvellous stories, known by the name of Wanley's Wonders of the little World, as well as in Quevedo's celebrated visions, we have many very remarkable stories of dreams. But the dream of Mr. Malone is so extraordinary, that it out-wonders all the wonders, that ever were recorded in any book whatever. Dreams are said to be copies of our waking impressions. This dream is therefore the more wonderful, as it cannot possibly be presumed to be a copy of any waking impression, that ever visited the understanding of Mr. Malone; for he dreams, Gentle Reader, that he is transported to Parnassus, and sitting as counsel for Shakspeare, among Apollo and his nine Sisters!!! and it is not to be supposed that this gentleman had ever any waking notions of  
making



making an excursion to Parnassus, and he is too modest and deficient to obtrude himself into the society of nine ladies, with whom he has so slight an acquaintance.

Then after a beautiful and fanciful description of the immortal bards in Elysium, who it seems were employed in practising upon their fiddles, the dreamer at last finds out the great dramatic poet playing at bowls with Spencer, Suckling and Hales. What is more remarkable still, he finds him out by his resemblance to a picture in the possession of the Duke of Chandos, "*three copies of which are in my possession.*" Here however, the dreamer has forgot what one of his fraternity has so fully proved with so much ingenuity and learning, namely, that it bears no resemblance at all to the authentic engraving of Droeshout, which has received the testimony of Ben Jonson. But that our immortal bard, who was the plaintiff in the suit, on the trial of which Mr. Malone was engaged as counsel, should be playing a game at bowls, is another astonishing proof of the extraordinary gift of dreaming, with which the critic is endued. Virgil describes the departed spirits in Elysium as occupied in the concerns and amusements with which they were gratified when alive. But the peep of our critic into those regions, will for the future correct the error of the antient mythology,

thology, from which Virgil derived his notion, unless Mr. Malone intends to gratify the world with a tract to prove from some of the documents *in his possession*, that Shakspeare, Suckling and Spencer were very fond of playing at the game of bowls or nine-pins.

But perhaps it is quite as remarkable that Shakspeare should have required the assistance of a counsel to appear in his behalf before Apollo and the Muses; and that he should have sent for Mr. Malone from the other world to undertake his defence. If it was necessary the cause should have been entrusted to a commentator, Apollo might have found out a crowd of critics, black letter compilers, and lexicographers, nay his old friends, Cotgrave, Minchen, Barret and Phillips. But one might have thought that amongst the sacred groupes, that thronged in those celestial regions, there would be no dearth of advocates in the cause of so distinguished a bard. Milton, Spenser, Cowley and Pope, would surely have been called into court instead of Mr. Malone, to protect the violated rights and the sacred reputation of a member of their own corporation, who one would have thought has suffered too much from the disputes of critics and commentators, to rely much upon their efforts in his cause.

Here I close my observations on the dream of  
Mr.

Mr. Malone ; and in the course of this pamphlet, I hope I shall have proved, that as a critic and a scholar, Mr. Malone is entitled to an equal degree of attention, whether he dreams or whether he is awake.

And here I would exhort the reader not to consider me as an advocate for the authenticity of the controverted MSS. The task of refuting the reasonings of Mr. Malone is distinct from that of establishing either the affirmative or negative proposition on this doubtful and mysterious question. I wish to defend the cause of literature and of sound criticism, which are effectually wounded if dogmatic assertions, insinuations, and misrepresentations are allowed to triumph over solid and substantial investigation. It would be a labour infinitely above my ability, though the very attempt would ennoble the meanest capacity, *melioribus humeris sustinendum*, to destroy the spirit of vague and conjectural criticism, which has ravaged the fields of poetry, imagination and science. How far I have succeeded, is a point on which I shall not presume to determine ; and I close the subject with the satisfactory consciousness, that in appealing to the world, I have laid the merits of my cause, before that tribunal, which will not suffer the voice of truth to be overwhelmed and extinguished.

F I N I S.





## A D D E N D A.

THE word *Master*, which Mr. Malone says was never thus spelt in the time of Elizabeth, will be found in the title to “*Fortescue’s new Book in Commendation of the Laws of England, printed in 1599, “ Written in Latin by the learned and right honorable Master Fortescue, Knt.”*

Grafton’s Chronicle, printed in 1569, has in the Epistle Dedicatory to Sir William Cecil, Knt. the Word, *Mastership* and *Maistership*, thus differently spelt in the same page.

For instances of double Christian names, I am favored with the following, since this work was printed.

*Henry Roger Boyle*, died in 1615: See Lyson’s London, Vol. 4, p. 365.

*Eyton John Seymour*: See Visitation of Berkshire.

*William Robards Smith*, anno 1604, Blomfield’s Norfolk, Vol. 3, p. 584.

## E R R A T A.

Page 31, line 8, for 1354, read 1534.

32, — 18, for Cotrave, read Cotgrave. Bullekar, read Bullokar and in Sherrwood, dele the second r.

35, last line but two, for in, read or to.

36, — 10, for Cronicle, read Chronicle.

43, — 21, after his work, read he says.

51, — 16, for similiar, read similar.

81, — 3, for rationai, read rational.

136, — 19, for Hubard read Hubbard.















